Ways of seeing : a study of opsis in Herodotus' Histories

Ways of Seeing:

A Study of ὄψις in Herodotus' *Histories*

Isabel Rose Milena Paintin

Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Birkbeck, University of London

DECLARATION

I declare that the work presented in this thesis is my own.

……

Isabel Rose Milena Paintin

Abstract

The thesis provides an in-depth study of ὄψις (*opsis*) ('seeing' or 'sight') in Herodotus' *Histories*. It explores both the use of *opsis* by Herodotus as a key source for his ἱστορίη (enquiry) and the rich and complex layers of stories involving *opsis* in the narrative of the text.

A close analysis of autopsy statements (direct and indirect) in Herodotus' metanarrative demonstrates that these are far more numerous than scholars have hitherto realised and that he was developing a new language of autopsy to signify the use of *opsis* as an investigative tool. When compared with other methods of enquiry such as ἀκοὴ (hearsay) and γνώμη (opinion / judgement / reasoning), *opsis* clearly emerges as the most reliable of – and a check on the other – sources of evidence.

Herodotus' narrative allows him to communicate a more nuanced portrayal of *opsis*. While some characters successfully use *opsis* to learn about the world or manage to manipulate it for their own ends, many misinterpret visual evidence or are deceived by what they see. Yet stories about *opsis* also closely parallel some of the key themes of the *Histories*: the rise and fall of great powers, the risks inherent in breaching boundaries and the dangers of ἔρως (desire).

Herodotus uses the narrative together with the metanarrative to educate his audience on how to conduct an investigation based on *opsis* and shows that a certain skill and intelligence (σύνεσις) is required to succeed. This in turn forms a core part of the strongly didactic nature of the text.

In his use of *opsis*, Herodotus was at least in part responding to contemporary debates on the value of empirical evidence for enquiry, as seen in the work of the Hippocratics and the Presocratic philosophers. However, Herodotus' innovation was to apply investigative methods based on *opsis* to historical material and an enquiry into past events.

Contents

Acknowledgements

The seeds of my interest in Herodotus' use of *opsis* were sown during my undergraduate studies at Oxford University and were nurtured during many enlightening discussions on the historian and his methods with tutors and fellow students. In particular, I am hugely indebted to the inspiring teaching of my Greek History tutors, Dr Oswyn Murray and Dr Lisa Kallet, who each provided a stimulating critical forum in which to explore some of my early ideas on the subject.

I am enormously grateful to my supervisor, Dr Christy Constantakopoulou of Birkbeck, University of London, for her innumerable research suggestions, wise guidance and extensive time spent reviewing several drafts of the text; without her constant encouragement, support and faith in both me and the project, this thesis would not have been completed.

Sincere thanks also go to my examiners at the PhD upgrade viva, Professor Catharine Edwards and Dr Serafina Cuomo, who provided constructive criticism of early drafts of Chapters 2 and 6 and suggested additional angles to explore.

I dedicate this thesis to the memory of my late mother, Elaine Paintin, who first encouraged me to embark on this research; to her I owe by far the greatest debt.

Texts and Abbreviations

Herodotus is cited from the *Oxford Classical Texts* edition of N. G. Wilson (2015). Translations are taken from R. Waterfield's *World's Classics* (Oxford, 1998) with some adaptations. J. E. Powell's *Lexicon to Herodotus* (Cambridge, 1938) assisted in navigating the text for *opsis* references and vocabulary. Citations in the form 1.1.1 refer to the *Histories* unless otherwise stated.

The Hippocratic texts are largely cited from the *Loeb Classical Library* edition of W. H. S. Jones (1923-31) with translations taken from Chadwick and Mann's *Penguin* (London, 1978) with slight adaptations, while translations of the Presocratic texts follow either R. Waterfield's *World's Classics* (Oxford, 2000) or J. Barnes' *Penguin* (London, 2001).

Translations of other Greek texts are taken from the *Penguins* with adaptations.

Transliterations of Greek words (in particular, *opsis*) are often (though not consistently) used.

For references to secondary literature the Harvard system of author and date is used. Abbreviations of journal titles follow the conventions of *L'Année Philologique* while other abbreviations are as below:

DK	Diels, H., rev. Kranz, W. (6th edn, 1951-2), *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker* (Berlin)
FrGrHist	Jacoby, F. *et al*. (1923-), *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* (Berlin and Leiden)
Fornara	Fornara, C. (1983), *Translated Documents of Greece and Rome: Archaic Times to the End of the Peloponnesian War* (Cambridge)
ML	Meiggs, R. and Lewis, D. (revised edn, 1988), *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century BC* (Oxford)

Chapter 1
Introduction

'The instant I looked at the fresco with a seeing eye, I mean with all faculties cooperating, I felt that it must be by Antonello'.

Bernard Berenson, *Three Essays on Method* (1927) 88[1]

1.1: Introduction

Bernard Berenson, the great art historian, succinctly highlights how a close visual inspection of an artwork combined with the accumulated knowledge and experience of an artist's work is the key to the methodology of connoisseurship, i.e., to determining the attribution of that work. In this thesis, I argue that a similar process, namely the use of ὄψις (*opsis*) ('seeing' or 'sight') to examine material things as interpreted through or moderated by knowledge and experience of the world is a crucial aspect of Herodotus' methodology as an investigator in the *Histories*, an aspect which has hitherto been given insufficient prominence by scholars.

Herodotus opens his great work by describing it as Ἡροδότου Ἁλικαρνησσέος ἱστορίης ἀπόδεξις ἥδε ('the exposition of the enquiry carried out by Herodotus of Halicarnassus'). The Greek word ἱστορίη (*historie*) is the origin of our word 'history', but had a far broader meaning of 'enquiry' (into customs, places, peoples, events, wonders) in Herodotus' day. Scholars have debated at length the precise meaning of the word as used in Greek literature, and Herodotus in particular, a question I will return to in detail in Chapter 3.

However, it is interesting to note that the word *historie* is etymologically related to the Indo-European root *wid-* / *weid-* / *woid-* meaning to 'see' or 'know' as indeed are the Greek verbs for seeing (ἰδεῖν) and knowing (attaining of knowledge through sight) (εἰδέναι).[2] Therefore at the heart of Herodotus' 'enquiry' is the idea of seeing and knowledge attained through looking at the world, which arguably suggests that eyewitness testimony plays a crucial role in historical investigation.

[1] As quoted in Cohen (2013) 87.

[2] Many scholars have noted this link: see Schepens (1980) 20 and (2007) 41, Bakker (2002) 13.

One of the problems in trying to establish what *historie* meant to Herodotus and his contemporaries is that he was writing in an age when the concept of different genres of enquiry (such as history, ethnography, medicine, science) had not yet been clearly established. That meant Herodotus' 'enquiry' could range widely over historical, archaeological, geographical, ethnographical and narrative material in a way which can seem quite strange to modern readers used to a more defined scope of topic.[3] This in turn has meant that some scholars have attempted to analyse the *Histories* by the standards and critical methods of modern historiography, resulting in at times severe criticism of Herodotus' methodology, most notably by Detlev Fehling.[4]

More recently, scholars have tried to avoid imposing modern theories of historiography onto the text and placing Herodotus within a particular genre (as we would understand the term).[5] This is why Branscome, for example, chooses to call Herodotus an 'inquirer', suggesting that this term encompasses the many aspects of his role as gatherer of information, traveller, investigator, interrogator of informants, narrator and critic.[6] Grethlein proposes that Herodotus (and Thucydides) should be seen as practising in the field of 'memory', both as descendants from Homer but also in creating a new method of writing about the past based on evidence from the human (material) world rather than claiming authority for their narratives from the gods (i.e., the Muse).[7]

---

[3] Although some scholars would see the *Histories* as the foundation stone of certain genres – see, for example, Alonso-Núñez (2002) 20-3 who argues that the idea of the succession of world powers in the work is crucial for the birth of universal historiography.

[4] See Fehling (1989), (1994).

[5] See, for example, Murray (2001) 322: 'in order to understand Herodotus we must cease to regard him as a historian, and see him as a narrator, whose narrative art is related to that of his sources. Herodotus should be accepted as the creator of a new generic form which only later became identified as history'; van Eijk (2008) 386: there was no contemporary distinction between 'philosophy' and 'medicine'; Skinner (2013) 233-57 on the 'ethnographical' material in the *Histories* and how this would have fitted within Herodotus' notion of 'historiography'.

[6] Branscome (2013) 13, 16 n.37.

[7] Grethlein (2010) 149. He also highlights (2013) 2 the tension in ancient historiography between capitalising on the advantage of hindsight (teleology) and trying to render the past as it was experienced by historical agents (experience).

Particularly apposite in this context is Bowden's comment: 'There were no writers of history before Herodotus, and therefore the "rules" of historiography were not yet established: what each writer chose to include in his story, and what he left out, was determined by what he thought was appropriate for his subject'.[8] Herodotus' methodological framework – the commentary he provides in the text about how he went about his enquiry, gathered and judged the material for his narrative and his opinions on sources or different versions of events – could therefore be seen as an attempt to establish 'rules' by which he analyses, filters and selects material; as Luraghi puts it, he is 'showing his audience the rules of a new game'.[9] I have adopted the term 'metanarrative' to describe this commentary and distinguish it from the narrative of the *Histories*, following scholars such as Luraghi who have indentified this exposition of the authorial persona as 'meta-*historie'* or 'metadiscourse'.[10]

The key pillars of this methodological framework established by Herodotus can be identified in his programmatic statement at 2.99.1 as ἀκοὴ (hearsay), ὄψις (personal observation), γνώμη (opinion / judgement / reasoning) and ἱστορίη (questioning of informants), the last three of which involve the active faculties of the investigator. Herodotus weaves these elements together to form a critical methodology to examine the oral, visual (and in some cases written) testimony he collects and create his masterful narrative of the Persian Wars.

This thesis looks at just one of these elements, *opsis*, and undertakes a full and detailed analysis of its use by Herodotus in his methodology as an investigator as well as its portrayal in the narrative of the text. The reason for the choice of *opsis* is twofold: first, it is the source of information that Herodotus consistently tells us (whether directly or by implication) is the most trustworthy and brings the enquirer closest to knowledge,[11] yet in terms of history-writing it has the obvious

[8] Bowden (2005a) 66.

[9] Luraghi (2006) 85.

[10] Luraghi (2001b) 141; (2006) 77: he suggests that Herodotus is inventing the new genre of 'meta-*historie'* which explains the first-person statements in the text.

[11] On Herodotus' 'hierarchy' of sources, see in particular Marincola (1997) 67 and 96; Luraghi (2001b) 143.

limitation that the would-be historian cannot personally be an eyewitness to past events – he therefore has to find other ways of 'seeing' the past.[12]

Second, as demonstrated below, *opsis* is the element that has received least attention from scholars; in particular, there has not been a study which encompasses the use of *opsis* by Herodotus in the metanarrative together with a detailed exploration of *opsis* in the narrative of the text. I intend to show that this is a fruitful juxtaposition.[13]

1.2: Scholarship on Herodotus' Methodology

Herodotean methodology has been a rich area of scholarly research and debate for many years. Despite the extensive work done to establish the influence of the writings of Herodotus' prose predecessors (now existing only in fragments) on his work,[14] the *Histories* seem to explode onto the fifth-century BC intellectual scene in terms of their extensive temporal and geographic scope, the interweaving of complex multi-layered narratives, their numerous narrative themes or motifs, and the bold, often polemical and didactic, presence of the author and his views throughout the text. Although much of the work of Herodotus' predecessors and contemporaries is lost to us, it seems reasonable to conclude with Lateiner that 'alternatively empirical and transcriptional, [Herodotus] produced the first coherent vision, based on historical data, of the human condition in various times and places'.[15]

Given his place in the emergence of Western historiography, scholars have naturally been keen to establish how the 'father of history' came to conduct the research necessary to write such a work.[16] How did he go about his investigation, what were his main sources, how was he able to establish the veracity of evidence

[12] Most obviously by examining the physical remains of the past. Dewald (1993) 57 notes that the visible world is full of meaning for Herodotus and that one of his key goals is to read the meanings contained in tangible objects.

[13] Fowler (2003) 306 brings the two together in commenting that '[Herodotus'] narrative is so skilful that it reads like the account of an eyewitness'.

[14] The work of Felix Jacoby clearly laid the foundation for this; see Fowler (2006).

[15] Lateiner (1989) 58.

[16] 'pater historiae' – Cicero, *De Legibus* 1.5.

gathered, was he influenced by earlier and contemporary developments in philosophical and scientific enquiry, are narrative elements such as direct speeches pure reconstructions or based on actual records – in short, what was the methodology he adopted?

Happily Herodotus tells us a fair amount about his approach to his enquiry, the travels he undertook to observe monuments and customs and interrogate his informants, his attempts to distinguish between differing accounts or explanations of the same events and his reasons for sharing or withholding information from his audience.

In a key programmatic statement in the text, Herodotus tells us at 2.99.1 that up to this point his account of Egypt has been governed by his own observation (ὄψις), judgement (γνώμη) and enquiry (ἱστορίη) but from now on he will relate the stories he has heard from the Egyptians (λόγους ... τὰ ἤκουον) as supplemented by his own observations.[17] This provides a succinct overview of the key sources or methods of enquiry which Herodotus deployed in his investigation: ὄψις (the personal observation by the investigator of events or things, which can also be described as autopsy – αὐτόπτης, see 2.29.1); ἀκοὴ or λόγοι (hearsay or oral accounts from his informants); γνώμη (the opinion or judgement of, or intelligent inference from, the evidence by the investigator); and ἱστορίη (in this context, the active interrogation of informants).

The pertinent question, however, is what these methods of acquiring information actually involve in practice and how they fit together and interact with one another in Herodotus' methodology (which will be explored in Chapter 3). In terms of general approaches, this huge and complex subject of Herodotean methodology was tackled by Lateiner in his 1989 work *The Historical Method of Herodotus*, an attempt to establish a new, arguably more sophisticated, approach to Herodotean methodology. However, Lateiner felt that the role of *opsis* was minimal (at least for the historical investigation): 'Herodotus and Thucydides ... overrated the

[17] μέχρι μὲν τούτου ὄψις τε ἐμὴ καὶ γνώμη καὶ ἱστορίη ταῦτα λέγουσα ἐστί, τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦδε Αἰγυπτίους ἔρχομαι λόγους ἐρέων κατὰ τὰ ἤκουον: προσέσται δέ τι αὐτοῖσί καὶ τῆς ἐμῆς ὄψιος.

significance of autopsy for determining the facts of history. The method has inherently crippling limitations for investigating times gone by'.[18]

Marincola provided a useful comparative study of Herodotean methodology in the context of Greek and Roman historiography,[19] while in a series of articles Luraghi established a more nuanced interpretation of Herodotus' *akoe* statements (such as 'the Persians say') as representing the ownership of traditions by a certain community rather than source-citations *per se*.[20]

Similarly, Marincola suggested that such statements refer to a known tradition of a community rather that an actual conversation which Herodotus had with his informants.[21] Luraghi posited that these references in addition to the framework of Herodotus' authorial interventions in the text 'together ... form a metadiscourse that we might call "the discourse of ἱστορίη", which underpins, with important variations of intensity, the whole of Herodotus' work', with *akoe*, *opsis* and *gnome* forming different branches of that metadiscourse.[22]

These approaches were developed at least in part as a response to the group of scholars critical of Herodotus' credibility as an investigator, a school of thought represented most (in)famously by Fehling[23] but promulgated and continued by scholars such as Armayor and West, who doubted the veracity of his research methods, his claims to have spoken to certain people and to have travelled to the places he mentions.[24]

Such sceptical appraisals are now very much in the minority, with scholars recognising that they tend to impose a modern understanding of historiography and critical methods on the text which would have been largely alien to Herodotus and his contemporaries at a time when genre distinctions (such as history) had not

[18] Lateiner (1989) 57-8.

[19] Marincola (1997).

[20] See Luraghi (2001b), (2006) and (2009).

[21] Marincola (1987) 127.

[22] Luraghi (2001b) 141.

[23] Fehling (1989) and (1994).

[24] See Armayor (1978a), (1978b), (1978c), (1980) and (1985); West (1985), (1992) and (2003). See also Dunsch and Ruffing (2013) for more recent reflections on the Fehling school of thought.

yet been formed.[25] Further, there is still much value to be gained from an exploration of Herodotean methodology independent of the question of whether or not he actually adhered to that methodology to the letter in practice.

1.3: Scholarship on Herodotus' Use of *Opsis*

A key focus of scholarly interest has been on the nature of *akoe* or oral sources, given that most of Herodotus' evidence and the stories he narrates would have been collected verbally from informants (such as temple priests) rather than from written sources. This has taken place in the much broader context of a growing understanding in the last eighty years or so of the importance of the oral tradition in Ancient Greek culture, discovered in the wake of the work done on oral tradition in African societies.[26] This accounts for the structure of some of the great works of Greek literature such as the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* which originally would have been retold and passed on orally.

However, far less attention has been paid to the role of *opsis* – except as part of the body of scholarship on authorial persona (for which see further below). The main reason for this appears to be that although scholars recognise the importance of *opsis* in Herodotus' methodology in that he rates it as his most trustworthy source,[27] most see it as being fairly limited in scope particularly in relation to an historical investigation given that the investigator cannot be an eyewitness to past events. It is certainly the case that in terms of numbers alone, there are far more statements of *akoe* than statements of *opsis* in the text and in this sense *akoe* can be seen as Herodotus' "main" source. But this fails to appreciate the significance of *opsis* for Herodotus in terms of his belief that it provides the surest guarantee of accuracy.

---

[25] See Luraghi (2001b) 138 criticising scholars from the nineteenth century onwards who interpret Herodotus 'in the framework of their own technical language'; also Lloyd (2012) 2 on the methodological problem of applying our own modern ideas and concepts to ancient systems of belief and ways of looking at the world.

[26] See in particular Vansina (1965), Parry (1971), Thomas (1992), Murray (2001).

[27] See, for example, Dewald (1987) 157, Hedrick (1993) 24, Marincola (1987) 125 and (1997) 67 and 96, Luraghi (2001b) 143 and (2006) 78, Gehrke (2010) 25, Corcella (2013) 45.

Among those who have looked at the subject in more detail, the foundation of modern studies of *opsis* in Herodotus is Schepens' 1980 work, *L''Autopsie' dans la Méthode des Historiens Grecs du Ve Siècle Avant J.C.* which is the first (and to date only) book-length consideration of the topic.[28] Originally conceived as a PhD thesis, Schepens' study sets out to show that personal observation of things and (for contemporary history) events was in fact central to the methodology of ancient historians, contrary to the view which grew from German approaches to ancient historiography in the nineteenth century that privileged written sources and concluded that the historian's autopsy could have little relevance for his historical method. He proceeds to illustrate this by a comparison of ways in which the two most important Greek historians, Herodotus and Thucydides, use autopsy.

However, in establishing that modern scholars struggle with the idea that autopsy could form a key part of an historical method, Schepens distinguishes between 'autopsy of events' (the historian writing about events and places that he has himself seen, i.e., contemporary history or investigation) and 'autopsy of things' (visual examination of material evidence), suggesting that the problem only existed with the former.[29] This means that his attempt to gain recognition for the importance of autopsy in ancient historiography has less relevance to Herodotus, who largely does not cover contemporary events.

Nevertheless, Schepens recognises the fundamental importance of *opsis* to Herodotus' investigative methodology, and to his historical investigation in particular, arguing that his interest in viewing monuments, temple dedications, inscriptions and other physical remains of the past is far more than that of a 'tourist' or 'sightseer', but rather demonstrates his appreciation that visible evidence provides a more reliable witness to historical events than do oral sources. Herodotus used *opsis* as a check on the oral tradition but did not always regard it as superior to detailed enquiries (*historie*). Schepens also convincingly argues that Herodotus was the first to apply personal observation to historical enquiry and the first to establish the methodological significance of autopsy.[30]

---

[28] For a brief summary of relevant bibliography before this, see Schepens (1980) 14-7.

[29] Schepens (1980) 4.

[30] Schepens (1980) 38, 41-5.

Yet despite its examination of the different ways in which Herodotus deploys *opsis* in his investigation, Schepens' study is highly theoretical in nature and does not really attempt a close or comprehensive analysis of the text, resulting in a rather sketchy overview of *opsis*. Nor does he provide any definitive list of autopsy references in the *Histories*, merely noting that expressions referring to autopsy can be extended without limit, without giving any justification for those discussed.[31] He focuses on the earlier books (especially Book 2) to the detriment of the later ones and sidesteps the debate on Herodotus' credibility. There is also no attempt to look at *opsis* in the narrative and how this may change our overall view of *opsis* in the text.

Müller took up the baton with his important 1981 article, in which he argues even more strongly than Schepens that empiricism is fundamental to Herodotean methodology: not only does autopsy provide the surest path to knowledge about the world, but the desire to learn through personal observation provided the motive for Herodotus' travels.[32] Müller explores the ways in which Herodotus uses *opsis* to verify the information provided by other sources, noting that it is the best tool the investigator has to convince his audience of the truthfulness of his account, and crucially suggests that Herodotus developed certain autopsy 'formulas' to indicate this verification role (to be explored in Chapter 2).[33]

Müller illustrates all this with a diagram showing the Herodotean epistemological method: this demonstrates that 'desire for knowledge' (βουλόμενος εἰδέναι)[34] is the impulse for investigation, with personal observation (*opsis*) as a single step to acquiring knowledge which can otherwise only be equalled by a multi-layered process of enquiry (*historie*), collection of oral reports followed by verification through *opsis* (where possible) or reasoning.[35] However, the pre-condition for this process to operate effectively is that the investigator must have the necessary

[31] Schepens (1980) 50.

[32] Müller (1981) 303.

[33] Müller (1981) 306. He also explores in depth the importance of οἰκός (Ionic for ἐοικός; what is probable or likely) for Herodotus in evaluating different accounts where verification through *opsis* is not possible.

[34] This is surely a reference to 2.19.3.

[35] Müller (1981) 312.

intelligence to interpret visual evidence correctly, a point which will be clearly underlined by the exploration of *opsis* in the narrative in Chapters 4 and 5.

Following Schepens' and Müller's analyses, attention has tended to focus more broadly on Herodotus' authorial presence in the text rather than on *opsis* specifically, although statements of autopsy clearly play a key part in that presence. Scholars have recognised that whereas previously poets such as Homer had relied on inspiration and guidance from the Muse to establish their credentials (hence once Homer has invoked the Muse at the beginning of the *Iliad* he need do nothing further to prove the veracity of his account), writers such as Herodotus practising in the relatively new field of *historie* needed to work harder to establish their authority to speak on their chosen subjects – whence the much higher number of authorial first-person statements in the text.[36]

Luraghi has noted that there is no parallel in ancient historiography to the sheer number of first-person authorial statements which appear in the *Histories*,[37] and which Munson has called 'glosses of *historie'*.[38] Dewald's work has been crucial in articulating and investigating the nature of these statements and she has counted 1,086 such statements in the text, over forty of which serve to question the veracity of the narrative of events recorded.[39] She has categorised these into four types of authorial intervention: the onlooker; the eyewitness investigator; the critic; and the writer, and names the author's persona the *histor* (ἵστωρ).[40]

These statements involve Herodotus passing opinions on the narrative (or different versions of it), recording his travels, interrogating particular people or individuals, and of course include his statements of autopsy; of these statements Dewald writes: 'The *histor*'s stance as an eyewitness investigator is a peculiar one.

[36] See Luraghi (2006) 87; Marincola (1997) 3-5 and 259-60, noting that 'assertions of inquiry' were fundamental to claiming authority to tell the narrative.

[37] Luraghi (2006) 76-7.

[38] Munson (2001) 31.

[39] Dewald (1987) 154 n.19 and (2002) 271.

[40] Dewald (1987); ἵστωρ in its primary meaning denotes a judge.

His experiences often mark the world as a more problematic and puzzling place than it had appeared before'.[41]

Here Dewald appears to refer to the role of *opsis* in confirming or refuting the evidence provided by *akoe* (to be explored in Chapter 3) and therefore sees it as adding a further layer of information about the world. Such authorial statements reveal the critical and evaluative dimension that the authorial voice adds to a narrative historical account.

Marincola scrutinises certain specific autobiographical remarks in the text, namely statements of autopsy and enquiry (i.e., contact with a specific source), counting forty-two in total, but he does not provide a rationale for his choice which at times seems inconsistent (to be discussed further in Chapter 2).[42] He concludes that such statements generally have the purpose of polemic or the correction of specific pre-existing accounts, but given that the majority of such statements are found in Book 2 (on Egypt) this is only really true for that book: 'In the books other than II, Herodotus is still present but no longer participant ... [he is only present by] his critical accumulation and assessment, by the synthesis and explanation of the various traditions within the narrative, and by the interjection of his own beliefs, or expressions of the limit of his credulity'.[43]

In terms of indirect statements of autopsy, some scholars have recognised that there are many places in the text where Herodotus indicates his exercise of autopsy by using phrases such as ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ or (ἔτι καὶ) τὸ μέχρι ἐμεῦ (+ verb), the use of the present tense to describe physical objects, or an adjective such as ἀξιοθέητος, but does not provide a direct authorial statement such as 'I saw'.[44] However, none have explored in any detail the extent and use of these phrases.

[41] Dewald (1987) 159.

[42] Marincola (1987).

[43] Marincola (1987) 130-3. The distribution of autopsy references in the text is discussed in Chapter 3.

[44] See, for example, Schepens (1980) vii, Smith (1987), Rösler (2002) 91, Scott (2005) 108, de Jong (2012a) 130-2.

1.4: Justification of a New Study on *Opsis*

As noted above, Schepens remains the only book-length study on *opsis* in Herodotus' *Histories* and this has certain omissions and drawbacks. Although scholars such as Dewald and Marincola have to some extent identified direct statements of authorial autopsy in the text and have recognised that in addition there may be other (indirect) methods by which Herodotus indicates the use of autopsy, there has been no attempt to establish a definitive database of authorial autopsy references (both direct and indirect) in the *Histories* via a close analysis of the text and then explore in detail the many ways in which Herodotus uses *opsis* as part of his methodology or practice of *historie*.

Furthermore, those scholars who are interested in the nature of Herodotus' authorial persona, including his use of autopsy, have tended to focus on the 'metadiscourse' without considering the use of *opsis* in the narrative of the text, by which is meant the many stories in the *Histories* which concern or involve *opsis* in some way. In fact, there is no comprehensive study of *opsis* in the narrative of the *Histories*. Yet the narrative has much to reveal about the use of *opsis*: the way in which characters use it to perpetuate their memory through the erection of physical monuments, create elaborate visual deceptions or propaganda, misinterpret visual evidence, use it to obtain or verify information, or merely marvel at visual spectacles.

Some scholars have noted that there are in fact close connections between the metanarrative and themes in the narrative of the text. For example, certain characters (usually tyrants) display enquiring methods similar to those of Herodotus and this may therefore be a way in which Herodotus demonstrates to his audience good and bad investigative practice (discussed further in Chapter 5).[45]

Arguably this is the kind of analysis which needs to be undertaken much more extensively in relation to *opsis* in order to discover how the portrayal of *opsis* in the

[45] There is extensive bibliography on these 'enquiring kings', but see, for example, Christ (1994), de Bakker (2012) 121, de Jong (2012a) 136; also Grethlein (2009) on Xerxes' continual failure to "write" a historical narrative; Harrison (2015a) 27, 29 on the geographic and ethnographic enquires of the Persian kings in the context of their imperialist ambitions.

narrative feeds back into our understanding of Herodotus' use of it in his investigation and of the message he is trying to convey to his audience about its merits as a source of information.

There is therefore a need for a new study of *opsis* in the *Histories*, one which provides a comprehensive database of authorial autopsy references, explores in depth the portrayal of *opsis* in the narrative, considers how the two interrelate and how this may in turn deepen our understanding of Herodotus' relationship with *opsis* as part of his investigative methodology, and asks what contribution Herodotus made to the establishment of an *opsis*-based methodology for *historie* in the context of contemporary enquiry.

1.5: The Importance of Seeing in Greek Culture

It is significant that Herodotus was carrying out his enquiry within the context of a highly visual culture. One only has to think of the visual nature of epic and its use of *ekphrasis* (perhaps most famously, the description of the shield of Achilles, *Iliad*, 18.478-608),[46] the dramatic spectacle of Greek tragedy[47] or the performative elements of Greek religion with its processions, rituals and pilgrimages.[48]

Further, the idea that eyewitness evidence (as opposed to hearsay) is more credible can be found throughout Greek literature from Homer (see *Odyssey*, 8.491, where Odysseus praises the accuracy of the bard Demodocus' account of the Trojan War as being akin to that of an eyewitness),[49] to Heraclitus' apparent claim that sight is ἀληθινωτέρας ('truer') than hearing in providing a path to knowledge,[50] and Herodotus' own statement (through the mouth of Candaules) that men trust their eyes more than their ears (ὦτα γὰρ τυγχάνει ἀνθρώποισι ἐόντα ἀπιστότερα ὀφθαλμῶν – 1.8.2).

---

[46] See in particular, Lovatt and Vout (2013), Squire (2013) and Elsner (2007).

[47] See Zeitlin (1994).

[48] See Goldhill and Osborne (1994), Elsner and Rutherford (2005b) and Rutherford (2013).

[49] ὥς τέ που ἢ αὐτὸς παρεὼν ἢ ἄλλου ἀκούσας ('[singing] ... as though you yourself had been there or had spoken to one who was').

[50] DK 22B101a; Polybius, *Histories*, XII xxvii 1.

It is not therefore surprising that undertaking travel to see the world (θεωρία) was highly valued as a path to wisdom,[51] as is underlined by Herodotus himself when he has Croesus describe the itinerant Athenian Solon as famous 'for your wisdom and wanderings, having journeyed through many lands for love of knowledge and to see the world' (σοφίης εἵνεκεν τῆς σῆς καὶ πλάνης, ὡς φιλοσοφέων γῆν πολλὴν θεωρίης εἵνεκεν ἐπελήλυθας) during their meeting at the beginning of the *Histories* (1.30.2).[52] Likewise by the fifth century BC, θεωρία had a secondary meaning of 'pilgrimage' which also combined the ideas of viewing and (divine) knowledge attained through that viewing.[53]

The link between travel and wisdom is one that appears throughout the *Histories*, via figures such as Solon and Anacharsis.[54] As Hartog has explored, the relationship between travel, seeing and knowledge is at the heart of Greek civilisation.[55] In the opening lines of the *Odyssey*, that prototype of all travellers, Odysseus, is described as one who 'saw the cities of many peoples and learnt their many ways' (πολλῶν δ' ἀνθρώπων ἴδεν ἄστεα καὶ νόον ἔγνω – 1.3) which neatly brings all three concepts together in one line.

It is not the intention of this thesis to look in any detail at the extent and nature of Herodotus' travels (which would provide enough material for a book-length study

[51] See Rutherford (2013) 149-55 on sightseeing as being vital to enquiry into the nature of the world. Corcella (2013) 45 notes that travel was seen by the Greeks as a solution to learning about the undiscovered regions of the world – the '*aphanes* in space'.

[52] Plutarch, *Life of Solon* 2, tells us that Solon started life as a trader, so travel was a core part of his identity. See Noussia-Fantuzzi (2010) 11-12 on the meeting between Croesus and Solon in the context of ξενία and travelling sophists in the fifth century BC.

[53] See Platt (2011) 11 and Rutherford (2001) 43 who argues that the two purposes of θεωρία, i.e., sightseeing and pilgrimage, became increasingly indistinguishable.

[54] As Wood (2016) has argued, Herodotus also characterises his narrative as a journey through space, using words of travel such as ἔρχομαι to describe the progression of his narrative, which underlines the connection between the collection of λόγοι and travel as well as knowledge with autopsy.

[55] Hartog (2001) 4.

in itself),[56] but given that travel was a prerequisite for Herodotus to be able to exercise his autopsy, the subject will be briefly examined.[57]

Arguably, travel formed the basis of Herodotus' enquiry, in that it was only by journeying through Greece, the Near East and Egypt, viewing monuments, customs and natural phenomena, and interrogating his informants, that he was able to gather the material for his work. Brown goes further in suggesting that it was the experience of exile from their native lands at some point in their lives suffered by many of the great historians of antiquity (Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon and Polybius) that prompted them to become historians.[58]

Herodotus gives us very few clues as to the practicalities of his travels and he probably made several individual journeys rather than embarking upon one 'Grand Tour'.[59] Nor does he tell us his original motivations for travel. Some believe he started out as a trader, others that he set out as a curious traveller but only conceived the idea for his *Histories* much later.[60] Exile, voluntary or enforced, due to the political situation in Halicarnassus may also have been a factor.[61]

As for the extent of his travels, however, the autopsy references in the text provide the rough parameters: Olbia to the north, Babylon (or even Ecbatana) to the east, Elephantine to the South, and the cities of Italy and Sicily to the West, though of course he also visited many places in between (Tyre, Sardis, Delphi, Corinth etc.). These autopsy references are not exhaustive; as Müller has pointed out, Herodotus

---

[56] An approach Schepens (1980) 52 also adopts.

[57] For Herodotus' travels (also in the context of Greek attitudes to travel) see Redfield (1985), Dougherty (2001), Montiglio (2005), Friedman (2006). As Dougherty (2001) 66 puts it: 'the narrative authority and credibility of the traveller depend on his being an eyewitness'. Schepens (2006) 83 notes that travel was a means for Herodotus to verify and amplify his information and thus travel was inextricably intertwined with his investigative method.

[58] Brown, T. S. (1988a) 17; this is, however, difficult to prove.

[59] Montiglio (2005) 137 suggests Herodotus' journeys were a mixture of planning and improvisation with detours fitted in when he needed to follow up a particular line of enquiry such as at 2.3 or 2.44.

[60] Wells (1923) 202 suggests Herodotus may have originally had commercial motives for his journeys; Lloyd (2004) 46 points out that there is no evidence Herodotus had a developed plan for his Egyptian λόγος before he visited the country, and may only have written it up a long time after his trip. This could account for some of the more surprising inaccuracies in his report.

[61] As, for example, Casson (1994) 97 suggests.

would not necessarily feel the need specifically to mention his presence in a place he was describing, especially those familiar to his audience, for example the sites of the famous Persian War battles – Thermopylae, Marathon, Salamis and Plataea.[62]

Herodotus must have travelled by ship for some of his journeys. Casson speculates that this would have been his main form of transport, though of course he would have had to undertake much land travel in Asia Minor, Syria, and Mesopotamia, especially on his trip to Babylon.[63] It has been suggested that Herodotus probably set out for Babylon from Tyre, making use of trade routes from Ionia, through Phoenicia and into Mesopotamia.[64]

Göttlicher describes one voyage we know Herodotus undertook, from Egypt to Tyre (ἔπλευσα - 2.44.1) which would have been about 400 miles long and probably lasted two to five days.[65] Indeed, this is the only occasion on which Herodotus specifically mentions a form of transport he used, although he talks about travelling generally (e.g., ἐτραπόμην – 2.3.1; ἐλθών – 2.29.1; ἦλθον – 2.75.1) and describes the approach to Egypt from the sea (προσπλέων – 2.5.2; ναυτιλλομένων – 3.6.1) as well as the route from Egypt along the Palestinian coast (3.5).[66]

Yet he does include several descriptions of routes in his work, such as the Persian royal road from Sardis to Susa (5.52-4) or the crossing of the Euxine Sea (4.86).[67] But his vivid descriptions of the places he visited and the things he saw are what won him the accolade of the 'world's first travel writer' in Casson's phrase.[68] Memorable examples include his fascination with the Babylonian boats (1.194), his description of the exquisite temple of Bubastis and its location (2.137-8), or his wonder at the intricacies of the Egyptian labyrinth (2.148).

Indeed, his use of the word θώμα ('wonder') to describe the most striking discoveries (θώμα occurs thirty-seven times in the text, θωμάσιος eight times,

[62] Müller (2004) 239.

[63] Casson (1994) 104.

[64] MacGinnis (1986) 81.

[65] Göttlicher (2004) 113.

[66] Asheri (2007) 42 suggests Herodotus travelled along this coast on his journey from Egypt.

[67] Corcella (2007) 643 believes Herodotus actually made the crossing himself.

[68] Casson (1994) 96.

θωμάστος five times) is one of the ways in which Herodotus evokes the excitement of travel, in coming across the tomb of Alyattes (1.93), the footprint of Heracles (4.82), or the Thasian gold mines (6.47). Herodotus clearly became the model for later generations of travel writers, such as Pausanias (in his *Periegesis*) and Lucian (*On the Syrian Goddess*) which underlines the importance of travel to his methodology and the impact of his persona as a traveller on later authors.[69]

1.6: Structure of the Thesis

The thesis comprises three broad sections: Chapters 2 and 3 examine *opsis* in the metanarrative, establishing a database of autopsy references in the *Histories* and considering how Herodotus uses *opsis* as part of his investigative method; Chapters 4 and 5 turn to the portrayal of *opsis* in the narrative, the ways in which characters in the text fail or succeed to use or interpret it successfully, before considering how the conclusions from this analysis may change our understanding of Herodotus' relationship with *opsis*; while Chapter 6 in part moves away from the text to look at the use of *opsis* by Herodotus' contemporaries, namely the Hippocratics and Presocratics, and compares this with the way *opsis* is deployed in the *Histories* to discover what Herodotus contributed to the development of enquiry based on *opsis*.

Using Marincola's list of specific statements of autopsy and enquiry as a starting point, a comprehensive database of authorial autopsy references in the *Histories* is established (a total of 146, listed in Appendix A). It is divided into five categories:

1. Statements of direct eyewitness
2. Objects that are claimed to be still there or customs, practices and traditions still practised in Herodotus' day
3. Descriptions of the current positions of physical objects
4. Use of the adjective ἀξιοθέητος (lit: 'worthy of sight')
5. Other statements which arguably amount to indications of autopsy

[69] For Pausanias, see Pretzler (2007): 'many readers of the *Periegesis* feel immediately reminded of Herodotus, and there is no question that the similarities are deliberate' (55); for Lucian, see Lightfoot (2003) who feels that he owes his greatest debt to Herodotus.

The database also includes statements of travel and contact with a specific source as these can assist in establishing whether other references to the same places are statements of autopsy.

Taking each of the five categories in turn, this study considers the justification for including the references chosen in the database, conducting a close analysis of the textual passages. It is argued that this exercise produces a far higher number of autopsy references than has previously been allowed by scholars.

The issue of credibility is not directly relevant to this thesis, focused as it is on aspects of Herodotus' methodology, a field of study which is independent of whether or not he actually put that methodology into practice. As with Luraghi: 'for my purpose the possible biographical implications of these statements [i.e., source citations] are irrelevant'.[70] However, given that attacks on his credibility have been a significant feature of Herodotean scholarship from Plutarch onwards, the opinions of scholars such as Fehling, Armayor and West are critiqued and a close analysis of controversial textual passages undertaken to show how Herodotus' credibility may be supported and/or the reference in question better understood or differently interpreted.

A detailed examination of *opsis* and its relationship to the other sources in the metanarrative follows, looking at how Herodotus uses it to gather material during his enquiry. In this context, *opsis* seems to have three key functions: to add information; to confirm that information supplied by another source or method is accurate; and to refute or cast doubt on such information.

The main role of *opsis* is to act as a check on the other sources, but this discussion looks at why Herodotus often chooses to indicate his autopsy indirectly rather than making a direct statement. The former is shown to be a shorthand he has developed where he only needs to demonstrate that *opsis* has performed a corroboratory role – unlike direct statements, indirect indications are never used to refute information from other sources but only to confirm or add to it. The variety of vocabulary used by Herodotus to indicate autopsy and the distribution of autopsy references in the text is also examined.

[70] Luraghi (2001b) 140-1; also (2006) 87-8. See also Wood (2016) 15 n.11.

Autopsy is shown to perform the role of a key source for Herodotus' enquiry and a way of establishing an authorial persona and authority to speak on the subjects discussed. This is a core element of the didactic nature of the text. Nevertheless, Herodotus also implies that a certain amount of intelligent interpretation is also needed to get the most out of *opsis* as a source.

The narrative of the *Histories* provides a rich supply of stories involving *opsis*. I explore how Herodotus uses the narrative to reveal a more complex portrayal of *opsis*, through characters who demonstrate an inability to use or interpret it, to be called 'victims of *opsis*', and those who successfully decode visual evidence or are able to harness *opsis* for their own gain, 'masters of *opsis*'.

In particular the eighteen dreams in the text show how visual messages can be difficult to interpret: in every instance, the dreamer either misinterprets or ignores the message of the dream, or fails to understand its full significance. This brings into question the purpose of dreams in the text and the various scholarly approaches to this issue are analysed.

The role of *opsis* in key events, the dangers of seeing 'too much' and therefore breaching an '*opsis* boundary' (as I have termed it) and the failure of visual propaganda in the Persian War provide other examples of characters' struggles with *opsis*. I explore these via detailed analysis of textual passages as well as their interplay with broader themes in the *Histories* such as the breaching of boundaries, the fall of great empires and the dangers of ἔρως (desire).

However, not all visual propaganda fails – most notably that deployed by the Greeks in the Persian War is highly successful – and visual deceptions are shown to be extremely effective, although Herodotus enjoys the inherent irony that their success rests on the very fact that people trust their eyes most of all the senses. I examine how Herodotus strategically deploys in the text characters such as Solon, Lichas, Proteus and Periander who either demonstrate an ability to interpret visual evidence correctly or conduct enquiries using an investigative methodology similar to that of Herodotus. These "internal enquirers" are both reflections of Herodotus as the investigator in the metanarrative and serve a didactic purpose in providing examples of successful investigation.

The role of physical monuments such as sanctuary dedications, trophies and inscriptions in providing a visible connection between past and present is also examined.

I argue that overall, while the portrayal of *opsis* in the narrative provides a more complex picture, its role there is ultimately to deepen the audience's understanding of how to interpret visual evidence and deploy it successfully in an enquiry. Further, the investigator requires intelligence (σύνεσις) and must be motivated by a desire for knowledge in order to realise fully the potential of *opsis* as a source. This is vital to appreciating the strongly didactic purpose of the *Histories* and the tripartite relationship in the text between Herodotus as narrator, the characters in his narrative and the audience of the work.

The use of *opsis* as a source must also be understood in the context of the fifth-century BC Ionian intellectual climate, in particular the work of Herodotus' contemporaries, the Hippocratics and the Presocratic philosophers. The last thirty years or so have seen an important development in Herodotean scholarship which seeks to interpret the *Histories* in the context of his time and so I examine how Herodotus was responding to contemporary ideas and debates on the use of empirical evidence as part of an investigation.

The parallels between the Hippocratics and Herodotus in this regard are striking, particularly in their promotion of autopsy as the most trustworthy source of knowledge about the world and use of visible evidence to draw conclusions about invisible phenomena. Herodotus, however, was innovative in using *opsis* for an enquiry into past events and human history. This may have been triggered both by the ambitious scope (temporal, geographic, ethnographic) of Herodotus' *historie* and his experience of encountering the visible remains of the past on his travels.

Yet there has been a scholarly deficit in appreciating this use of *opsis* by Herodotus and recognising its importance for the development of Western historiography. This may at least in part be due to the division of branches of knowledge into separate disciplines in the modern era and (until relatively recently) the traditional focus of historians on political rather than cultural history, which has made the broad scope of the *Histories* and Herodotus' use of material evidence

seem at times incoherent. However, Herodotus' pioneering application of *opsis* to historical investigation deserves to be understood.

Chapter 2

Opsis in the Metanarrative:

The Nature and Extent of Herodotus' Autopsy References

ταῦτα γὰρ ὦν καὶ ἡμεῖς ὠρῶμεν ὅτι ὑπὸ χρόνου τὰς χεῖρας ἀποβεβλήκασι, αἳ ἐν ποσὶ αὐτέων ἐφαίνοντο ἑοῦσαι ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμέ

'I actually saw the statues, and it was obvious that the passage of time was responsible for the loss of their hands, because right up to my day they could still be seen lying on the ground at the statues' feet'.

Histories, 2.131.3

2.1: Introduction

What is the significance of autopsy – 'seeing for oneself'? Herodotus' statements of autopsy – αὐτὸς ἐγὼ ὥρων (4.195.2) – seem to exude the self-confidence and authority of the eyewitness. Indeed, in innumerable contexts the eyewitness account has been favoured as the strongest form of evidence. In his history of the Peloponnesian War, Thucydides famously claims that the historian should only report on contemporary events. He assures his readers that he has 'appl[ied] the greatest possible rigour in pursuing every detail both of what I saw myself and of what I heard from others [eyewitnesses]' (ἀλλ' οἷς τε αὐτὸς παρῆν καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἄλλων ὅσον δυνατὸν ἀκριβείᾳ περὶ ἑκάστου ἐπεξελθών – 1.22.2).[1]

A similar principle applies to our modern-day criminal courts, where the general rule is that a witness should only give evidence about something of which he has first-hand knowledge, while hearsay evidence was inadmissible until fairly recently with the introduction of the Criminal Justice Act 2003.

Yet despite a broad consensus on the evidential value of seeing for oneself, Herodotus' claims to autopsy have often been the subject of great controversy among scholars in the ongoing debate about the historian's credibility. For scholars such as Armayor, Fehling and West, these claims merely provide proof that the *Histories* are an unreliable guide to the ancient world in the seventh to fifth

[1] Thucydides is also aware, however, of how reports of eyewitnesses to the same event can be contradictory either because of partiality or failure of memory (see *Peloponnesian War*, 1.22.3).

centuries BC and to their author's travels: Herodotus was a 'poet' rather than an historian.[2] On the other hand, the defenders of his integrity such as Pritchett seek to prove the veracity of his every statement.[3]

As outlined in Chapter 1, Herodotean autopsy, closely intertwined as it is with questions of his credibility, is a part of his historical methodology which is long overdue for a fresh analysis. First, however, it is important to establish the extent of autopsy references in the metanarrative: are they limited to words for seeing or are there other key phrases and vocabulary in the text which signal to the reader that Herodotus' autopsy is at work?

In this part of the discussion, the focus is on Herodotus' methods rather than his practice: not on whether Herodotus really saw the things he mentions, but whether he intended his audience to think that he had done so.[4] However, the doubts about Herodotus' credibility cannot be ignored, so an attempt will be made to establish whether some of Herodotus' more controversial claims to autopsy are genuine – and whether it matters.[5] Does their veracity or otherwise really affect our appreciation of the role autopsy plays in the author's theoretical method?

2.2: The Extent of Herodotus' Autopsy References

As noted in Chapter 1, Schepens' work is rare in focusing exclusively on autopsy, and even he does not provide a definitive list of authorial autopsy references in the *Histories*, although he does identify the main categories of eyewitness statements.[6] Marincola is the only scholar to have compiled such a list, both of autopsy references and statements of personal contact with a specific source which can be

[2] Armayor (1978a), (1978b), (1980), (1985); Fehling (1989); West (1985) and (2004). The quotation is from Fehling (1989) 155.

[3] Pritchett (1993).

[4] In this I am aligning myself with the approach taken, for example, by Munson, who emphasises that she wishes to investigate the meaning of the metanarrative and narrative, rather than their factual truthfulness. Indeed, she adds (2001) 19 that 'an investigation of the meaning Herodotus attributes to facts he narrates would be even more urgent if he had invented them rather than seen or heard them'.

[5] Pritchett (1993) has dubbed Herodotus' critics 'the liar school' and Fehling his defenders the 'apologists'.

[6] Schepens (1980); see 48-51.

helpful in determining the extent of Herodotus' autopsy. Marincola's list is reproduced below:

Statements of autopsy:

2.8.1.-3; 2.10.1; 2.12; 2.29; 2.43; 2.75; 2.106; 2.125; 2.127; 2.131; 2.143; 2.148.1; 2.155; 2.170; 3.12; 4.81.1-2; 4.86.4 (?); 4.195; 5.59; 6.47.1; 7.129.4

(Twenty-one references)

Denial of autopsy:

1.183; 2.73.1; 2.156.2

(Three references)

Personal contact with a specific source:

1.20; 2.2.5; 2.13.1; 2.19; 2.28; 2.32; 2.52; 2.54.2; 2.77.1; 2.91.4; 2.104; 2.113; 2.118; 3.55.1-2; 4.14.1; 4.76; 4.95; 9.16.1

(Eighteen references)

General remarks:

2.99.1; 2.147.1

(Two references)

In total, he has found forty-two 'specific statements of autopsy and inquiry'.[7] Unfortunately, Marincola does not fully explain his rationale for choosing these particular citations, and while I would agree with the inclusion of all of them, there appear to be certain discrepancies in his choice. For example, he accepts the phrase ἐφαίνετό μοι ('it appeared to me') as an indication of autopsy at 2.10.1 (land gained from the sea in Egypt), 2.155 (temple within the precinct of Leto at Buto), and 7.129.4 (rift valley in Thessaly); but he excludes 1.51.3 (Croesus' bowl at Delphi) where exactly the same phrase is used. Similarly, he includes 2.170 (the ponds in Sais and Delos) which uses the phrase ως ἐμοὶ ἐδόκεε ('as it appeared to me') among statements of autopsy, yet excludes 2.5 (land in Egypt which has been gained from the Nile) and 3.5 (city of Cadytis) where the same phrase is used. Marincola may have reasons for these omissions, but he does not divulge them.

[7] Marincola (1987) 122.

It is also unclear why he specifically picks out 2.148.1 (ἐγὼ ἤδη εἶδον), when 2.148.5-6 contains αὐτοί τε ὠρῶμεν ... αὐτοὶ θεησάμενοι ... αὐτοὶ ὠρῶμεν. Possibly he views this as repetition, given that all refer to the Egyptian labyrinth.[8] There is another omission under denial of autopsy: at 2.150.2 Herodotus says he could not see the earth excavated from Lake Moeris (οὐκ ὥρων). In his statements of personal contact with a specific source, it is also puzzling why Marincola includes 2.5, 2.13.1 and 2.19 (conversation with the priests in the temple of Hephaestus, among others), but excludes 2.3.1 where Herodotus speaks to the same priests (ἐλθὼν ἐς λόγους τοῖσι ἱρεῦσι τοῦ Ἡφαίστου).

Other scholars have subsequently used Marincola's list as a basis for their own research and arguments.[9] But the inconsistencies in the list mean it cannot provide a definitive database of autopsy references for the current study. In any case, this list is limited to explicit autopsy references, and there may be other phrases used by Herodotus with which he indicates his autopsy, as argued below.[10]

Smith has also discussed the extent of autopsy references in Herodotus. He does not provide a definitive list, but he does consider that certain features in the text – precise descriptions and measurements of monuments, phrases indicating present time (e.g., ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ), shifts to direct speech in a tense indicating present time – are all indicators of autopsy when applied to physical objects.[11] This is an important move towards exploring the broadest possible range of potential autopsy references in the text. Due to the lack of a fully-justified and broad-ranging list of references, I have compiled my own database of autopsy references in Herodotus: the full list can be found in Appendix A. These references have been grouped into five key sections:

---

[8] There is also an error in the citation of 2.43 as a statement of autopsy – presumably 2.44 (εἶδον ... εἶδον) is meant.

[9] See, for example, Luraghi (2001b) 151; Braun (2004) 266; Branscome (2013) 4.

[10] Dewald (1987) 156 has counted thirty-four autopsy references in the text, but acknowledges (n.23) that scholars often accept that autopsy is indicated in other places in the text where it is not explicitly stated.

[11] Smith (1987) 127. See also his Chapter 6 where Smith enlarges on the thesis that (117) 'Herodotus need not necessarily state his firsthand knowledge of every monument he saw and included in his history ... We must therefore be open to the possibility that he may refer in the history to monuments that he had seen firsthand without declaring his autopsy'.

1. Statements of direct eyewitness
2. Objects that are claimed to be still there or customs, practices and traditions still practised in Herodotus' day
3. Descriptions of the current positions of physical objects
4. Use of the adjective ἀξιοθέητος (lit: 'worthy of sight')
5. Other statements which arguably amount to indications of autopsy

Finally, there is a list of references where Herodotus claims to have travelled personally to a place or spoken with a specific source, as these can help establish whether other references which relate to these same places are statements of autopsy.

1: Statements of Direct Eyewitness

The most obvious autopsy references are those where Herodotus specifically tells us that he personally saw something – statements of direct eyewitness. Overall, I have identified forty-seven such statements which can further be divided into three sub-categories: those which use words for seeing (ὁραω, θεάομαι, θωμάζω, ὄψις ἐμὴ) of which there are twenty-five; words for appearing, seeming or showing when applied to physical objects (ἐφαίνετό [μοι], ἐμοὶ ἐδόκεε, δῆλος, δείκνυμι) of which there are twenty-three; and other vocabulary which amounts to autopsy as its use requires Herodotus' physical presence in a particular location (such as μετρέω) – there are four. Sometimes a statement may include words from the first two of these sub-categories (hence the element of overlapping between sub-categories) which is further evidence that the words in the second sub-category are part of Herodotus' autopsy vocabulary.

<u>1(a): Words for seeing</u>

Statements which include the language of authorial eyewitness such as εἶδον and ὄψις ἐμὴ need no further explanation as to why they belong among a database of autopsy references. However, other less obvious statements perhaps require further justification. In a couple of places, Herodotus decides to describe objects for those who have not seen them: the Phoenician Pataici (ὃς δὲ τούτους μὴ ὄπωπε, ἐγὼ δὲ σημανέω – 3.37.2) and the bowl set up by Pausanias at the mouth of the Euxine Sea (ὃς δὲ μὴ εἶδέ κω τοῦτον, ὧδε δηλώσω – 4.81.4). Arguably, he could

not speak with such authority unless he is indicating here that he has seen these objects himself.

There is a similar passage at 2.106.5 where Herodotus criticises those who have seen the carved figure of Sesostris in Ionia and believe it to be of Memnon. Again, he could hardly claim greater knowledge than other eyewitnesses unless he had also seen the carving, given his belief that autopsy provides the best form of proof.[12] West (usually a critic of Herodotus' credibility as regards his autopsy) agrees that Herodotus is giving the impression of first-hand observation here: 'his authoritative manner creates the presumption that he speaks of what he has himself observed'.[13]

At 2.136.1, Herodotus tells us that all the gates of the temple of Hephaestus in Memphis have figures carved on them and 'countless other views [i.e., marvels] of construction' (καὶ ἄλλην ὄψιν οἰκοδομημάτων μυρίην). Herodotus claims elsewhere to have visited this temple (2.2.5; 2.3.1; 2.13.1; 2.19; 2.113.1; 2.118.1) so the use of *opsis* in the description of its gates can fairly be included as a reference to autopsy. A similar argument can be employed to justify the inclusion of 2.135.3 (Rhodopis' dedication of iron spits at Delphi) where Herodotus says it is still possible to see to what a tenth of Rhodopis' fortune amounted: ἰδέσθαι ἔστὶ ἔτι καὶ. He claims to have seen Croesus' silver bowl in the temple at Delphi (1.51.3) and have spoken with the locals (1.20).[14]

Finally, Herodotus' description of the temple of Bubastis at Bubastis and its position is from the viewpoint of a spectator: there is no other temple 'more pleasant to be seen' (ἡδονὴ δὲ ἰδέσθαι οὐδὲν τούτου μᾶλλον – 2.137.5) and it is possible to look down on it and into it from all around (κατορᾶται πάντοθεν ... ἔσοπτόν ἐστι – 2.138.2). The description is extremely detailed and has been held by commentators to be accurate despite the modern site's ruinous state:

[12] See Chapter 3 for the role of autopsy in Herodotus' methodology.

[13] West (1985) 302. Of course she also believes that Herodotus did not in fact see the relief. But the question of whether Herodotus is indicating use of autopsy on a particular occasion is separate from whether he actually saw the object described, as is discussed below.

[14] For Croesus' relationship with Delphi, see Parke (1984) and Skinner (2013) 219-20.

Herodotus' 'observations and diagnosis are ... impeccable' according to Lloyd.[15] So the accuracy of the description and the three different words for seeing justify the inclusion of this passage among direct autopsy statements.

1(b): Appearing, seeming, showing

The inclusion of most of the statements in the second sub-category (ἐφαίνετό [μοι], ἐμοὶ ἐδόκεε, δῆλος, δείκνυμι) is justified because of the word μοι: if Herodotus tells us that a certain object or building 'appeared *to me*' to be X or Y, it seems very likely he is claiming to have seen it. However, such expressions can also mean 'in my opinion' or 'I think' rather than indicating autopsy. Some may argue that Herodotus has this cognitive meaning in mind rather than autopsy, so it is worth examining these phrases in more detail.

First, it should be reiterated that all these expressions refer to physical things and some specifically to physical characteristics of those things. So for example when Herodotus uses the phrase ἐμοὶ ἐδόκεε to refer to the pond at Sais and the city of Cadytis in Palestinian Syria (2.170.2 and 3.5.2), he is specifically commenting on their size in relation to another pond (at Delos) and another city (Sardis). At 2.8.3, he uses the same phrase to refer to the distance between the Arabian and Libyan mountain ranges at the narrowest point (200 stades), so it seems clear that in these instances autopsy is implied.[16]

In other places, the phrase is used as a substitute for a more obvious word for seeing such as ὁράω. When Herodotus visits the temple of Zeus at Thebes and speaks with the priests, they show him the wooden statues of the high priests (δεικνύντες οἱ ἱρέες ἐμοὶ – 2.143.3), each representing a generation and thus providing a useful timeline. In describing the sanctuary of Apollo and Artemis at Buto, Herodotus mentions τὸ δέ μοι τῶν φανερῶν ἦν θῶμα μέγιστον παρεχόμενον (lit: 'the greatest wonder of the things that appeared to me there' – 2.155.3) which is the temple of Leto made out of a single block of stone. In both these examples, the word for showing / appearing coupled with μοι is clearly a substitute for a verb of seeing.

[15] Lloyd (1988) 95.

[16] Lloyd (1988) 209 concurs that Herodotus' use of ὡς ἐμοὶ ἐδόκεε at 2.170.2 refers to his autopsy and (1976) 55 that at 2.8.3 he is setting out his geographical theories on the basis of *opsis*.

At 2.10.1, Herodotus comments that in Egypt the land from the sea to Elephantine has been recently gained from the sea: κατά περ οἱ ἱρέες ἔλεγον, ἑδόκεε καὶ αὐτῷ μοι εἶναι ('this is what the priests told me, and it also seemed to me to be the case'). Here Herodotus appears to be appealing to two different sources to back up his statement about Egyptian geography, *akoe* and *opsis*, just as he does in many other places in the work, so the double source citation strongly supports the argument that ἑδόκεε ... μοι here refers to autopsy. In the very next sentence the phrase ἐφαίνετό μοι is used in further support of his view, to describe how the land south of Memphis between mountain ranges looked like a gulf of the sea.

In other places in the text, phrases such as ἑδόκεε μοι and ἐφαίνετό μοι could be argued to be expressions of opinion (e.g., 2.5.1, 2.103.1 and 7.129.4). But in these three places, the phrases are coupled with other words for sight such as ἰδὼν (2.5.1 and 7.129.4) and φαίνονται (2.103.1) which when taken together are a clear indication of autopsy.[17] So for example, Herodotus says that in his opinion / it appeared to him (ἐμοὶ ἐφαίνετό) that the ravine in Thessaly was caused by an earthquake, and gives as his explanation that 'anyone seeing' (ἰδὼν) the ravine would say that Poseidon (the god of earthquakes) was the cause (7.129.4). Overall, therefore, the arguments for including these phrases among statements of direct eyewitness are very strong.

However, I have also placed in the second sub-category of direct eyewitness statements those where Herodotus uses the verb φαίνομαι for physical objects, but without the word μοι. Some of them can be easily justified because they also include vocabulary from the first sub-category: this is true of 2.12.1, 2.103.1 and 3.47.3.[18] At 2.104.1 (discussed further below), Herodotus claims that the Colchians 'appear' (φαίνονται) to be Egyptians. Autopsy should be understood here as he also speaks directly with Colchians (as well as Egyptians) and describes their physical appearance – εἰρόμην ἀμφοτέρους. Herodotus also uses the same word at 2.130.1 and 2.132.1 (φανερή; φαίνει) in his precise description of the wooden cow in the palace at Sais. As he specifically says he saw other wooden statues in the

[17] In the case of 2.5.1, it also forms part of a much larger passage on the geography of Egypt where *opsis* is clearly a key source: see Lloyd (1976) 38.

[18] Lloyd (1976) 66 underlines the 'insistence on autopsy' at 2.12.1.

room next door (2.131.3), autopsy of the cow seems very likely indicated by this word.[19]

That this is true for these passages adds strength to the argument that autopsy is equally indicated in other places where the verb is used to describe physical objects, namely at 1.93.3 (the plaques on Alyattes' tomb), 4.82 (footprint of Heracles by the Tyras River), and 9.85.3 (tombs at Plataea). Herodotus speaks of the numbers on Alyattes' tomb being 'counted / measured' (μετρεόμενον) which, given his penchant for measuring elsewhere (2.127.2 and 4.86), suggests this is another personal investigation.[20] We also know he visited Sardis (3.5.2). As for the footprint of Heracles, Pritchett for one believes Herodotus personally saw it.[21] Certainly the third person plural ('they point out' – φαίνουσι) suggests the author is being shown round by a guide, and Herodotus mentions other monuments along this river (4.11.4). Finally, it is highly likely that Herodotus intended it to be understood he had visited Plataea as it was one of the key battle sites in the Persian Wars.

1(c): Other vocabulary amounting to autopsy

The third and final sub-category of direct eyewitness is also mainly self-explanatory. At 2.127.2 and 4.86, Herodotus can be found measuring physical phenomena, both man-made and natural (Cheops' and Chephren's pyramids [22] and the Euxine Sea[23]). At 2.125.6, Herodotus is standing by Cheops' pyramid while his

[19] Lloyd (1988) 79 agrees that the sources for the wooden cow are likely autopsy and information from the priests at Memphis.

[20] Herodotus also gives the tomb's measurements. Asheri (2007) 145 comments: 'the measurements seem to have been obtained empirically, not by calculation'.

[21] Pritchett (1993) 193.

[22] See Lloyd (1988) 74 on 2.127.2: an obvious indication of autopsy in his view. He suggests Herodotus probably carried out his measurements by using pacing to measure the base of the pyramids and then assessing the height either by eye or by counting the number of casting-blocks and converting this into an overall height using the height of the blocks at the base of the pyramid; alternatively he may have assumed there was a fixed relationship between base and height. Any of these methods would explain the inaccuracy of his figures.

[23] See West (2003) on the Euxine (or Black) Sea in Greek literature, in particular 151-2 on Herodotus' measurements; Lloyd (1987) 215-84 on the use of measurement in ancient Greek science; Rood (2012) 125-31 on the measurement of geographical space and distances in Herodotus; Sergueenkova (2016) on Herodotus' measuring of space as part of his attempt to grasp the unknown; Clarke (2018) on geographical space in the *Histories*. Clearly a sea and a pyramid are

interpreter reads out and translates the inscription on it.[24] Clearly, autopsy is a necessary part of all these activities.

However, the inclusion of 1.193.4 must be explained. Here Herodotus refuses to inform his readers of the height of the millet growing in Babylon, as anyone who has not been to Babylon will not believe the figure (τοῖσι μὴ ἀπιγμένοισι ἐς τὴν Βαβυλωνίην χώρην ... ἐς ἀπιστίην πολλὴν ἀπῖκται) – therefore he must have been there as he believes it. The words for travel here are a substitute for autopsy: Herodotus is saying that one really has to see the crops for oneself to believe their height – seeing is believing. As he himself has seen them he has secure knowledge of their size (ἐξεπιστάμενος). Moreover, Herodotus was quite correct in finding the size of the millet 'unbelievable'.[25]

It is also worth noting that in five places Herodotus specifically denies having seen something (the statue of Zeus (Bel) in Babylon; a live phoenix; the excavated earth from lake Moeris; the movement of the island of Chemmis; wine jars in Egypt).[26] The potential significance of these passages will be explored in the next chapter, but what is interesting here is that because Herodotus is so specific in the details of what he did *not* see, we can also use these passages as evidence for what he *did* see. So Herodotus did not see Chemmis move, but that implies he did see the island itself; he could not see where the earth excavated from Moeris had gone, but that he was looking for it suggests he did see the lake; he did not see the statue of Zeus, but this implies he was in the sanctuary looking for it. It is because of Herodotus' precision on these points that we are able to pick up further indications of his autopsy.

---

two very different subjects to measure; see further Chapter 6 on Herodotus' use of measurement in the context of his application to manmade monuments of methods more regularly used for assessing natural phenomena.

[24] Quite clearly the translation is a fabrication by the interpreter, but the fact that he misled Herodotus as to the content of the inscription does not detract from Herodotus' autopsy here: see Lloyd (1988) 70.

[25] The species Giant Millet is still grown in Iraq and can reach 4 metres in height: MacGinnis (1986) 80. Asheri (2007) 209 also comments: 'the extreme fertility of the irrigated area is an ascertained fact'.

[26] 1.183.3; 2.73.1; 2.150.2; 2.156.2; 3.6.1.

2: Objects that are claimed to be still there or customs still practised in Herodotus' day

A close reading of the *Histories* suggests that there are many other places where the author intends his audience to realise that authorial autopsy is at work, i.e., indirect indications of autopsy.[27] One of the main ways in which this is done is by the repeated use of certain key phrases or words throughout the text to imply autopsy. I shall call these Herodotus' 'motif phrases'.

The most common are statements that something is 'still there' in Herodotus' own day, the majority of which refer to physical objects (such as temple dedications and monuments). Sometimes these phrases are used to refer to what might very broadly be termed customs, practices or traditions (such as the paying of tribute or the habitation of a region by a particular group of people). For completeness the references to customs as well as objects are included as a separate list in Appendix A.

There are three motif phrases in this category: ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ (+ verb) which occurs twelve times in relation to objects, six to customs; (ἔτι καὶ) τὸ μέχρι ἐμεῦ (+ verb) which occurs twice in relation to objects, five to customs, and is used once in denial of an event; and ἔτι (καὶ νῦν) (+ verb) which occurs three times in relation to objects, three to customs.[28] The crucial word which links all three of these phrases is ἔτι – the idea that an object or tradition which originated in the past still exists and thus provides a visible connection between past and present.

The phrase ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ has caught the attention of scholars, who have given it various interpretations. Gehrke, for example, has emphasised that its use by Herodotus places him firmly within the contemporary Ionian intellectual environment of Presocratic philosophers and Hippocratic writers given that it indicates a personal examination and critique of received traditions.[29] Of particular interest is the fact that Herodotus often uses it with a verb in the imperfect tense

[27] Schepens (1980) vii notes the existence of such indirect statements in the ancient historians, characterising them as detailed and vivid descriptions indicating autopsy hidden in the text.

[28] De Jong (2012a) 132 believes these phrases denote autopsy in the text (see further n.58 below).

[29] Gehrke (2010) 23-4. See also Gerhke (2001) 298 on the development of a 'scientific historiography' from Hecataeus through to Herodotus and Thucydides which consisted of a 'philosophical search for the truth by critical analysis and authorial self-consciousness'.

(fourteen times) as opposed to the present (four times), for example, the chains hanging in the temple of Athena Alea in Tegea '*were* still safe in my time' (ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἦσαν σόαι – 1.66.4). This has the effect of 'historicising' his own investigative activities, as scholars have noted.[30]

Unsurprisingly, Fehling sees this phrase as further evidence that Herodotus employs fictive proofs in the *Histories*. He argues that the frequent use of the phrase with the imperfect tense is a failsafe for the author: 'a hint of the mutability of things would be an apt way of preparing the reader for not finding an object were he ever foolish enough to try to check up on such a statement'.[31] Fehling does not run through all the occurrences of the phrase to justify this premise, nor does it sit comfortably with his often repeated belief that Herodotus is not a 'fraud':[32] his interpretation requires Herodotus to be attempting to pull the wool over his readers' eyes at the very least.

Fehling is also inconsistent when he states that the rocks preserved at Delphi which frightened off the Persian invaders may well be a genuine monument because Herodotus was not as free to invent monuments at Delphi as he was elsewhere.[33] Yet Herodotus uses this very same phrase for these rocks: ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἡμέας ἦσαν σόοι ... κείμενοι (8.39.2).

The use of this phrase with the imperfect tense could be seen as further evidence of Herodotus' precision as a researcher: this monument was there when Herodotus visited the site, but he is now writing at a later date and so his autopsy is in the past at the time of writing, yet he has no reason to doubt that the object in question is still there.[34]

A similar interpretation is suggested by Rösler who argues that when Herodotus speaks of his own time in the past tense it is the equivalent of saying 'when I last visited X'. He cannot use the word νῦν because he cannot be sure whether there

[30] For example Rösler (2002) 94 and Bowie (2007) 130.

[31] Fehling (1989) 130.

[32] Fehling (1989) 155 for example.

[33] Fehling (1989) 129.

[34] See Naiden (1999) for a more detailed discussion.

have been changes since his visit. But Rösler goes on to reject this interpretation in some cases because, for example in the case of Croton (5.45), Herodotus was living near enough in Thurii to be able to go and check.[35] Rösler is perhaps a little harsh on his own theory: unless Herodotus wrote this passage while actually in Croton, he would still technically be recording a visit that already lay in the past at the time of writing the *Histories*.[36]

Yet this historicising of his own autopsy does indicate an awareness of mutability and of Herodotus' own place within an historical continuum: although writing in the present, his work is intended to be a record of the past for future generations (as indicated in the proem) for whom his own activities (autopsy included) will one day be past events.[37] Thus his use of the imperfect tense demonstrates that he always has in mind these future readers.[38] This is an aspect picked up by van Wees who suggests that the choice of the phrase ἐς ἐμὲ rather than νῦν confirms that Herodotus has his eye on future generations for whom past events can be 'wiped out by time' (τῷ χρόνῳ ἐξίτηλα – proem).[39]

However, the choice of the imperfect rather than the aorist tense may also point to an awareness that his past investigations have a present and even future impact: inspired by hearing about Herodotus' activities, his audience may embark on their own enquiries and go to 'see for themselves' thus furthering one of the aims of the

[35] Rösler (2002) 91-2.

[36] Hornblower (2013) 158 agrees that the phrase καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἔτι at 5.45.2 referring to plots of land in Croton still occupied by descendants of Kallias in Herodotus' day 'is most naturally taken as evidence of a personal visit by Herodotus, and interrogation by him of Kallias' descendants'.

[37] In this context, Naiden (1999) 136 suggests the imperfect tense may also be an indication by Herodotus that certain objects may not exist in the future.

[38] Naiden (1999) 142 draws attention to this "future present" of the text: 'it exists in a perpetual present, whether the present is conceived as a series of performances occurring each time the work is recited, or as a literary convention which endows the author with a living presence'; Raaflaub (2010) 201 also points to the universal themes in the *Histories* as an indication that Herodotus had future generations of readers in mind; see also Grethlein (2013) 221-2 on this, noting that 'Herodotus does not consider his viewpoint as absolute, but anticipates future vantage points'.

[39] van Wees (2002) 332. Rösler (2002) 92 also notes this self-consciousness: 'Herodotus re-creates himself as a figure of the past, to which he, as author, looks back. The writer's glance back at himself coincides with the perspective of the future reader, whose perception of the *Histories* as a work from the past is anticipated in the text'.

Histories that great ἔργα should not be wiped out by time.[40] This phrase along with the other two – (ἔτι καὶ) τὸ μέχρι ἐμεῦ and ἔτι (καὶ νῦν) – also serve to connect the past with the present by finding current (and thus visible) traces of past events.[41] They are therefore a vital part of Herodotus' use of autopsy for his historical investigation (of which more in the next chapter).

The past and present are also linked in the sense that past events provide an explanation, if not a cause, for present circumstances which in turn can be evidenced by the visible traces of the past; this role of the historical narrative in the *Histories* has been emphasised by Raaflaub.[42] It is also worth noting that half the (ἔτι καὶ) τὸ μέχρι ἐμεῦ references use a past tense and the other half a present, while all those with ἔτι (καὶ νῦν) have a verb in the present tense – not surprising as four out of six of them include the word νῦν.[43]

Foxhall and Luraghi have also pointed out that the Greeks used visible monuments and inscriptions to influence how future generations might perceive and interpret what for them would be past events – they served both a commemorative purpose but also provided an approved version and explanation of the past as written by those who had experienced it.[44] In this context, the strong sense in the *Histories*

[40] Sedgwick (1957) 116-7 has also seen Herodotus' use of the imperfect tense as part of his vivid story-telling technique, following Homer. Both Herodotus and Homer perceive an act not as a bald historic event but as part of an ongoing drama: 'they see the thing happening, or think of the continuing effects'. Sedgwick compares this with the effect of the historic infinitive and present in Latin.

[41] See Grethlein (2013) and Grethlein and Krebs (2012) on the interrelation of time past, present and future in classical historiography. Barker and Pelling (2016) 229 note the spatial element of the past having 'an active presence in the here and now' in the *Histories*.

[42] Raaflaub (2010) 200: 'Herodotus corrected, even distorted, history in order to connect the past with the present, to let past and present interact with each other: the present offered the historian a template for the presentation and interpretation of the past so that the past could become for his audience and readers a means to understand, interpret and cope with the present.'

[43] Naiden (1999) 138 suggests that καὶ here means 'all the way in spite of circumstances' not 'even' in the sense of 'my time rather than another', i.e., it is 'emphatic rather than responsive'.

[44] Foxhall and Luraghi (2010) 11. This is an aspect of the concept of 'intentional history' which they describe (9) as 'the projection in time of the elements of subjective, self-conscious self categorisation which construct the identity of a group as a group'; cf. Gehrke (2010) 16: intentional history is 'history as an expression of a group's self-perception'; Gehrke (2001) 304: the purpose of intentional history is both to establish causation for events and to categorise oneself as belonging to a particular group. No doubt the creation of a narrative of the past through the construction of

that the author is writing for future generations at once becomes familiar to a Greek audience.

But can we be confident that the use of these motif phrases is an indicator of autopsy? Scholars have not made this link specifically, although it is often implicit in their interpretations, for example Rösler's suggestion (see above) that it is synonymous with visits to certain places, or Scott's that is a 'biographical marker'.[45] One argument that adds strength to the link with autopsy is that in the majority of cases these phrases refer to objects or places for which there are statements of direct eyewitness or authorial presence elsewhere in the text. This can clearly be seen when all potential autopsy references are laid out by place across the five main categories identified above, as has been done at Appendix B.

This reveals that of the twelve times ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ is used for objects, eight refer to places for which there are also direct eyewitness statements and/or statements of travel or contact with a specific source.[46] A further two are backed by other references where indication of autopsy is very likely.[47] For the six which refer to customs, there is an overlap for three of them.[48] For the phrase (ἔτι καὶ) τὸ μέχρι ἐμεῦ the figures are less promising: although the two which refer to objects are supported by direct eyewitness references,[49] of those that refer to customs only one of the five is so supported (7.111.1 – and this only by statements for Thrace generally) and one by another potential autopsy reference (2.113.2). But for ἔτι

---

physical monuments can be seen as part of this explanation and self-categorisation with an eye on future generations.

[45] Scott (2005) 108.

[46] 1.52; 1.92.1; 1.93.2; 1.181.2; 2.130.1; 2.131.3; 4.124.1?; 8.39.2. There is a question mark by 4.124.1 because of uncertainty over the identification of the River Oarus. If it is the Dneiper, as Corcella (2007) 661-2 suggests, then we have a direct eyewitness reference close by for Exampaeus (4.81.2).

[47] 1.66.4; 5.77.3 – see ML 28 and Liddel and Low (2013b) 8 supporting Herodotus' autopsy here.

[48] 2.30.3; 3.97.4; 6.42.2.

[49] 2.154.5 refers to the slipways for warships and ruined houses of the first Ionians and Carians who came to Egypt, situated on the Pelusian mouth of the Nile close to the sea near Bubastis. Lloyd (1988) 137-9 and (2007) 355 suggests an identification with the mercenary camps at Daphnae, but in any case autopsy of Pelusium (3.12) and Bubastis (2.137.5; 2.138.2) seems sufficient to back up this reference.

(καὶ νῦν), all references (apart from 7.178.2) whether referring to objects or customs are supported by words or other citations for direct eyewitness.

A closer analysis of a few examples underlines the importance of these connections. At 1.52 and 1.92.1, Herodotus describes dedications made by Croesus in the temple of Ismenian Apollo in Boeotian Thebes as ἐς ἐμὲ ἦν ἔτι καὶ / καὶ ἔτι ἐς ἐμὲ ἦν.[50] As elsewhere he specifically says he saw 'Cadmean writing' in this same temple (εἶδον δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς – 5.59), the phrase is very likely to be an indication of autopsy.[51] If this is so, it can be extended to Croesus' dedications at Ephesus and Delphi which are included in the same phrase at 1.92.1.[52] This is supported by the contrast Herodotus makes at 1.92.2 with Croesus' dedications at Branchidae about which he has only learnt: τὰ δ' ἐν Βραγχίδῃσι ... ὡς ἐγὼ πυνθάνομαι. This is because the temple and its contents were completely destroyed by the Persians during the Ionian revolt, as Herodotus explains elsewhere (6.19). So Herodotus is making the contrast between those of Croesus' dedications he has seen and those he has not.[53]

Similarly, autopsy of the two wooden statues dedicated in the Heraion on Samos by Amasis (ἱδρύατο ἔτι καὶ τὸ μέχρι ἐμεῦ – 2.182.1)[54] is supported by direct eyewitness of his linen breastplate in the same sanctuary (3.47.3) as well as

[50] See Papazarkadas (2014b) 247 who suggests that the discovery of an inscribed dedicatory epigram at Thebes which may refer to the dedications made by Croesus there described by Herodotus at 1.52 'proves … that Herodotus had indeed visited the Theban Ismeneion'; see Thonemann (2016) also in support of Herodotean autopsy here. See Chapter 3 for further discussion of this inscription.

[51] Hornblower (2013) 179 states 'there is no good reason to doubt the claim to autopsy' at 5.59 and argues that West (1985) is too harsh in doubting it.

[52] Parke (1939) 148-9 also points to the level of detail in Herodotus' descriptions of Croesus' dedications at Delphi, including weights and measures, as evidence that 'clearly his statements are the result of observations on the spot at Delphi'.

[53] A conclusion supported by Asheri (2007) 144, and also Smith (1987) 124: 'the contrast unambiguously means that he knows of the surviving votives personally'.

[54] Lloyd (1988) 236 suggests the εἰκόν here actually means 'painted portrait' as indicated by γραφῇ εἰκασμένην; the statues presumably resembled the goddess Neith. Wooden statues, they stood on the East side of the cella: 'the detailed information is of a piece with Herodotus' excellent knowledge of Samos' (238).

numerous other potential autopsy references for the Heraion and Samos generally (see Appendix B), clear evidence that he visited the island.[55]

Another example might be the iron spits dedicated by Rhodopis at Delphi (καὶ νῦν ἔτι συννενέαται – 2.135.4), a location amply covered by direct eyewitness (1.51.3) and specific contact with the locals (1.20). One passage of particular interest is 2.131.3 where Herodotus describes seeing the wooden female statues in the royal palace at Sais: ταῦτα γὰρ ὦν καὶ ἡμεῖς ὡρῶμεν. But he also uses the ἐς ἐμὲ motif phrase to refer to the hands of the statues which were lying on the floor at their feet: ἐφαίνοντο ἐοῦσαι ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμέ. In this case it is undeniable that the author's autopsy is implied by the use of this phrase.

Overall, therefore, the correlation of many of these motif phrases with other statements of direct eyewitness and/or travel provides convincing evidence that they are another way for the author to demonstrate to his audience that his autopsy is present. If this is the case, then arguably the other places where they are used, for which there are no supporting references, are also indications of autopsy, for example, the statue of Athena dedicated by Ladice in Cyrene (2.181.5), the Phoenician trireme dedicated at the Isthmus after the battle of Salamis (8.121.1), or the cult of Onesilus as practiced in Amathous, Cyprus (5.115.1).[56]

There are good reasons for believing that this is so, not least because Herodotus is a researcher for whom seeing objects or traditions provides vital evidence for the reality of past events and who frequently makes careful distinctions between types of sources. As the majority of these motif phrases can be shown to be the equivalent of autopsy references, why would such a meticulous investigator use

[55] Scholars have come to realise that Samos plays an even greater role in Herodotus' narrative than was originally understood. See, for example, Irwin's suggestion that Polycrates' Samos is the sixth-century BC predecessor to Pericles' Athens and that in his retelling of Samian history, Herodotus is inviting his audience to draw parallels with the Samian revolt of 439 BC: Irwin (2009). This makes detailed autopsy of Samos even more likely. Hornblower and Pelling (2017) 102 note Herodotus saw the battle of Lade *stele* in the Samian agora.

[56] Lloyd (1988) 234 does not think the passage at 2.181.5 necessarily means Herodotus saw the Cyrene statue: 'Chamoux [(1953) 150] ... takes this to mean that Herodotus had actually seen it ... but the wording of the clause does not justify that conclusion. Since there is no incontrovertible evidence that Herodotus ever visited Cyrene, his presence there must remain an open question'. The present question, however, is not whether Herodotus in fact saw these objects or customs, but whether he intended his audience to think that he had (see further below).

the same phrases (often word for word) to describe objects or traditions where autopsy was not meant? For these reasons the motif phrases have been included in the autopsy references database.

3: Descriptions of the current positions of physical objects

Another favourite method of Herodotus for referencing physical objects important in his narrative, such as temple dedications, monuments and buildings, is to describe their current position and location in the present tense. Occasionally, a perfect tense is used with a present meaning (e.g., πεπόλισται – 7.59.2). As with the motif phrases discussed above, this has the effect of linking past with present and providing actual physical proof of past events.

I have divided these references into two sub-categories: those which include the words καὶ (usually in the meaning of 'still') and/or νῦν alongside the location verbs κεῖται, ἵδρυται, ἐστὶ, εἰσὶ or ἔστηκε (there are sixteen); and those which simply have one or more of the location verbs κεῖται, ἵδρυται, ἐστὶ, εἰσὶ, ἔστηκε, ἑστᾶσι or some others in perfect tense (there are thirty-one). A complete list can be found in Appendix A.

Out of a total of forty-seven passages, thirty-one refer to objects in locations which are also covered by statements of direct eyewitness and/or of travel or personal contact with a specific source (see Appendix B).[57] A further four are also covered by one of the motif phrases, three of which are in Athens (5.63.4; 5.77.4; 5.89.3), and one by the adjective ἀξιοθέητος (3.47.3). Of the eleven others, three refer to one location, Thermopylae (7.176.3; 7.225.2; 7.228).

Often very precise location details are also given, such as the tomb of Hyperoche and Laodice at Delos which is inside the sanctuary of Artemis, on the left with an olive tree growing over it (τὸ δὲ σῆμά ἐστι ἔσω ἐς τὸ Ἀρτεμίσιον ἐσιόντι ἀριστερῆς χειρός, ἐπιπέφυκε δέ οἱ ἐλαίη – 4.34.2), or the courtyard of Apis built by Psammetichus opposite the southern gateway of the sanctuary of Hephaestus, Memphis (ἐποίησε τῷ Ἡφαίστῳ προπύλαια ἐν Μέμφι τὰ πρὸς νότον ἄνεμον

[57] These thirty-one passages are: in category 1 (with καὶ and/or νῦν): 1.50.3; 1.69.4; 2.112.1; 2.141.6; 3.142.2; 6.14.3; in category 2 (just a location verb): 1.14.2-3; 1.51.2-4; 1.93.6; 1.178ff; 2.91.2; 2.99.4; 2.130.2; 2.132.1; 2.124.4-5; 2.153; 2.169.4-170; 2.176; 3.57.2; 4.33.3, 34.2, 35.4; 4.162.3; 7.30.2; 7.59.2; 8.27.5; 8.121.2; 8.122; 9.52; 9.81.1.

τετραμμένα, αὐλήν τε τῷ Ἄπι, ἐν τῇ τρέφεται ἐπεὰν φανῇ ὁ Ἆπις, οἰκοδόμησε ἐναντίον τῶν προπυλαίων – 2.153), or most of the dedications at Delphi (to which nine of these passages refer).

This level of detail seems characteristic of someone who has visited the places in question, and this alongside the frequent overlapping with other eyewitness references provides strong evidence that Herodotus is intending us to pick up that his autopsy is present.[58] Indeed, Smith has referred to the choice of present tenses to describe monuments as 'Herodotus' most regular method for indirectly indicating his autopsy of a monument, often marked with a transition like *kai nun*'.[59]

4: ἀξιοθέητος

This adjective literally means 'worthy of sight' or 'worth seeing' although is often translated as 'remarkable' or 'wonderful'. Sometimes it is broken down to a noun and adjective (θέης ἄξιος). It commands its own section among potential autopsy references because of the frequency with which Herodotus uses it to describe physical objects (twelve times out of a total of fourteen occurrences) and because it contains an explicit word for seeing. The word also occurs twice in the narrative of the text (see below). Further, it often reads like a visitor's recommendation – Herodotus saying that a particular site or dedication is worth looking at. Interestingly, several centuries later Pausanias also used the word to describe things he had seen on his tour of Greece (e.g., *Periegesis*, I.3).[60]

But scholars differ on the significance of the word. Asheri believes it amounts to autopsy at 1.14.3 where it is used to describe Midas' throne at Delphi, and that θέης ἄξιον to describe Alyattes' silver bowl (1.25.2) 'indicates direct knowledge

[58] De Jong (2012a) 130-2 agrees that phrases such as καὶ νῦν ἐστὶ and τὸ μέχρι ἐμεῦ are used throughout the text to indicate that the information in question derives directly from Herodotus, not another source. For example, she describes Herodotus' use of the phrase νῦν ... ἐστὶ in relation to the precinct of Proteus in Memphis (2.112.1) as 'a piece of *opsis*'. The precinct of Proteus contains a sanctuary of Aphrodite (ἐστὶ ... 2.112.2) which Herodotus interprets as a shrine to Helen; Munson (2012) 200 also considers Herodotus' autopsy to be his primary source here.

[59] Smith (1987) 126.

[60] For discussion of Pausanias, Herodotean influence on him and his use of ἀξιοθέητος, see Alcock, Cherry and Elsner (2001) and Pretzler (2007).

and admiration for the technique of iron-soldering'.[61] However, Flower and Marincola take a different view. When Herodotus describes the corpse of Masistius as θέης ἄξιος (9.25.1) they comment: 'this expression, less common than ἀξιοθέητος, is used only four times ... Both expressions often have the sense of 'worth going to see', although the words by themselves do not imply the narrator's autopsy'.[62] However, it is not really fair to base such a comment on this particular passage as it is one of only two (the other is 9.109.1) where Herodotus uses the word within the narrative, not the metanarrative to which the other twelve references belong.

At 9.25.1 Herodotus is describing the corpse of the Persian commander being paraded before the Greek army, and at 9.109.1 the shawl which Amestris made for Xerxes – not objects Herodotus could ever have seen, nor would he have intended his readers to think that he had.[63] Thus these two references are not in the same category as the other twelve which refer to objects existing in Herodotus' own day and included by him as part of his historical investigation. Indeed, when Flower and Marincola discuss such an object (Mardonius' bronze manger dedicated by the Tegeans in the temple of Athena Alea) their position is more of a compromise: 'the phrase need not imply autopsy ... though given Herodotus' time in Lacedaemon (where he met the Spartan Archias) he may well have seen the manger'. As for the temple of Athena Alea, Flower and Marincola note that at 1.66 Herodotus also refers to the chains dedicated by the Tegeans as still hanging there in his time: 'it is quite possible that Herodotus actually visited the temple'.[64]

Moreover, ten out of the twelve occurrences of the word refer to objects in places for which there are also statements of direct eyewitness and/or travel or personal contact with a specific source. Often these are places for which there is a high number of other autopsy references, such as Delphi, Samos, Sais, Memphis and Heliopolis (see Appendix B).

---

[61] Asheri (2007) 86, 93. He points out that Alyattes' bowl is mentioned by Pausanias (X 16.1-2) and Athenaeus (V 210b-c) who also describes it as 'truly worth seeing' (ἀληθῶς θέας ἄξιον).

[62] Flower and Marincola (2002) 145.

[63] See Asheri (1978) 209 for discussion of 9.109 as the beginning of the final act in a tragedy which will end with the deaths of Darius and Xerxes (not covered in the *Histories*).

[64] Flower and Marincola (2002) 229.

As for the two occurrences where no such overlap exists (2.182.1 and 9.70.3), there are other categories of autopsy references which point to autopsy here. At 2.182.1, Herodotus describes the breastplate dedicated by Amasis to Athena on Lindos as ἀξιοθέητον, but this breastplate is also mentioned at 3.47.3 when it is compared to a similar one sent to the Spartans by Amasis but stolen by the Samians and now in the Heraion: τοιοῦτος ἕτερός ἐστι καὶ τὸν ἐν Λίνδῳ ἀνέθηκε τῇ Ἀθηναίῃ Ἄμασις ('the other one which Amasis dedicated to Athena in Lindos is also like this'). The use of the present tense (ἐστι) and the comparison with another breastplate which Herodotus almost certainly saw (θωμάσαι ἄξιον ... ποιέει; φανεράς – 3.47.3) supports the argument that ἀξιοθέητον at 2.182.1 indicates autopsy. Asheri agrees: 'Herodotus must have seen the corselet of Lindos'.[65]

As for 9.70.3 (Mardonius' bronze manger in the temple of Athena Alea), the chains dedicated by the Tegeans in the same temple are covered by the motif phrase ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἦσαν σόαι (1.66.4 as discussed above).[66] We also know Herodotus claimed to have been in Sparta (3.55.2), a region bordering Tegea.

In sum, there is much evidence that ἀξιοθέητος does imply autopsy when used in the metanarrative. This only becomes clear when one examines all its occurrences throughout the text and alongside other autopsy references as opposed to focusing on one specific use.

5: Other potential autopsy statements

There are three other passages in the text where autopsy seems strongly implied but which do not fit into any of the four categories above. Two of them concern Samos: one is the bronze bowl sent by the Spartans to Croesus which ended up in the Heraion (1.70), the other the picture (with inscription) of Darius and his army crossing the bridge over the Bosphorus dedicated in the Heraion by Mandrocles

[65] Asheri (2007) 444-5; he adds that the very same breastplate was examined many years later by Licinius Mucianus, *consul suffectus* in the 70s AD (Pliny, *NH* XIX 12); Lloyd (1988) 237 also notes that fragments of the breastplate survived down to Roman times and that although no example of such a breastplate survives today, a painting on the rear wall of Side Room M in the tomb of Ramesses III apparently depicts one.

[66] Asheri (2006) 205 also links these two passages – Herodotus was likely to have seen the bronze manger at the same time as the Tegean chains. The temple of Athena Alea was destroyed by fire in 395 BC. See Asheri (2006) 265 for a discussion of the legend of Mardonius' treasure.

(4.88). We have firm evidence that Herodotus visited the Heraion: 2.182.1, 3.47.3 and 3.123.1 are all autopsy references for dedications in this temple. Herodotus' description of the decoration and size of the bronze bowl prompts Asheri to describe it as 'this splendid crater which Herodotus evidently saw in the Heraion'.[67]

As for Mandrocles' painting, Herodotus' description and exact quotation of its inscription is enough even for the usually sceptical West: 'Herodotus must have seen these Samian inscriptions for himself, probably on many occasions and at leisure'.[68] Corcella agrees: 'Herodotus was able to see the picture dedicated by Mandrocles ... in the Heraion ... The picture of Darius on the throne which Herodotus saw in Samos'.[69]

The final reference (2.134.2) concerns Mycerinus' pyramid at Giza. We know Herodotus claimed to have visited Giza (2.125.6; 2.127.2) which strongly suggests autopsy is implied for this pyramid, too. But Herodotus also describes the pyramid and adds that some Greeks believe Rhodopis built it, but they are wrong because 'the building of a pyramid such as this' (πυραμίδα ἀνέθεσαν ποιήσασθαι τοιαύτην) could not be her work. His judgement here is clearly based on the physical appearance (and thus autopsy) of the monument which indicates to him that it must have cost a fortune to build, beyond Rhodopis' resources.[70] There may be other passages in the text where Herodotus' autopsy is at work, as, for example, Lloyd and Smith have pointed out, but I have confined this list to those which can be clearly substantiated by other references in the text.[71]

---

[67] Asheri (2007) 131. See Boedeker (2012) 24 on the conflicting accounts of the Spartans and the Samians as to how the bowl ended up in the Heraion, as reported by Herodotus (1.70), in the context of a discussion about characters in the *Histories* using different accounts of the past for their own ends.

[68] West (1985) 283. This comment also refers to the *stele* in the agora at Samos inscribed with the names of those who fought at the battle of Lade.

[69] Corcella (2007) 645.

[70] See Lloyd (1988) 84-5 for an analysis of the tradition which connected Rhodopis to this pyramid.

[71] Lloyd (2007) 227 comments on Herodotus' Egyptian travels: 'many other areas which he mentions may have been subjected to his personal attention, even though he does not explicitly say so; it is also intrinsically probable that he visited many sites to which he does not even refer'. For Smith, see n.11 above.

Overall, therefore, across the five categories discussed above, I have identified 131 autopsy references in the *Histories*, or 146 if those in the second category which refer to customs are included. In other words, there are 146 passages where Herodotus either explicitly or implicitly indicates to readers that his autopsy is at work. This figure is considerably higher than Marincola's twenty-six, but then this search has much wider parameters and includes motif phrases such as ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμέ and words such as ἀξιοθέητος which Marincola did not consider for his list.

The high figure gives some indication of the importance of autopsy to Herodotus as a method for evidence-gathering in his enquiry, and why this is a crucial (though so far rather neglected) topic for Herodotean scholars to consider. Even if some would dispute that all those references listed under the second and third categories amount to autopsy, a concern for the current location of physical objects which are the product, and visible evidence, of past events amounts to a concern for the use of autopsy in historical enquiry.

The significance of autopsy for Herodotus, how he uses it for his investigation and its relationship with his other sources will be investigated further in Chapter 3. One particularly fascinating issue is the high frequency of autopsy references in certain locations such as Delphi, Samos, Athens, Memphis and Sais (see Appendix B).

2.3: The Credibility of Herodotus' Autopsy References

The extent of autopsy references in the *Histories* is a different issue from whether Herodotus actually saw the items mentioned: he states that he saw the upper rooms in the Egyptian labyrinth (2.148), but not all believe that he really did. It is not at all clear that his contemporary audience would have equated the narrator's credibility with accuracy in the modern sense, however the question of credibility continues to raise its head and so much scholarly debate has been devoted to the subject that it cannot simply be ignored.

I will examine the general arguments of those at the more extreme end of the 'liar school' to see whether they have undermined our faith in any of Herodotus' autopsy claims, before turning to discuss the credibility of some of the more controversial autopsy references in his work.

Detlev Fehling has argued that the majority of source-citations in the *Histories* are fictive. While we are concerned here with autopsy references rather than citations of oral or written sources, it is worth briefly considering Fehling's view of these sources also as it is part of his overall view of Herodotus' credibility. He believes that Herodotus' oral source-citations (such as 'the Persians say') do not reflect the testimony of real oral sources but have been invented by the author according to a set of rules or principles such as citing the obvious source for a story, a regard for party bias, and the dovetailing of different sources for the same story.[72] In other words, Herodotus' methods are presented as purely literary rather than genuinely investigative.

This is not the place to examine such a claim in detail, but the best response to it has come from scholars such as Luraghi and Marincola who have suggested that Fehling has misunderstood the nature of Herodotus' oral source-citations. Rather than 'the Persians say' amounting to 'the authoritative tradition of that community' as Fehling believes,[73] the formula is probably not a specific source-citation at all: rather it may simply reflect the opinions which a particular group were thought by the Greeks to hold. Or as Luraghi puts it: '[Herodotus] is simply presenting to his audience the local knowledge in a recognisable way, and his *akoe* statements are not intended to spell out the source of such knowledge, but rather to make explicit what today's oral historians would call its "social surface" – that is, the group to which it belongs, the group which holds it to be true'.[74] Marincola makes a similar point when he suggests that 'the Persians say' means 'this is a Persian tradition', not 'this is what the Persians said to me'.[75]

Fehling's final verdict on the autopsy references is that 'nearly all his statements based on avowed personal inspection (autopsy) have turned out, contrary to the natural assumption, to be pure fiction ... We find that it is simply not Herodotus' practice to invoke autopsy as a confirmation of anything that could really be

[72] Fehling (1989) 8-10.

[73] Fehling (1989) 8.

[74] Luraghi (2001b) 158-9. See also (2006) 84.

[75] Marincola (1987) 127. See also Shrimpton (1997) who with Gillis has compiled a list of Herodotus' source-citations to put Fehling's theories to the test; they argue (243) that Fehling fundamentally misunderstands the nature of oral historiography.

seen'.[76] He does of course analyse many of these references in detail, but before doing the same it is worth considering the consequences his conclusion has for our overall picture of Herodotus. Fehling criticises scholars for considering Herodotus' source references in isolation from one another rather than the credibility of the work as a whole; [77] this approach applied to Fehling's own work is revealing.

The main difficulty with Fehling's view of the *Histories* is that no coherent picture emerges of the purpose or the *modus operandi* of the work after the assault on its author's credibility. That this is so can be demonstrated as follows: Fehling is insistent that his view does not lead to the consequence that Herodotus was defrauding his readers by fooling them into believing he really had questioned certain sources or seen certain things – the choice is not between Herodotus the historian or Herodotus the fraud, but rather the author was a poet.[78] He is not a fraud because that would suggest he was falling foul of some current objective standard of historiography which was not in fact in existence at that time.

Fehling further asserts that Herodotus has in fact invented a new literary form with its own set of rules,[79] one in which the author creates a series of pretend travels, enquiries, personal observations, and uses stock motifs to promote a false sense of credibility, such as not being able to discover a certain piece of information or not being convinced by a source.[80] However, if Herodotus had invented such a literary form, his first audiences or readers presumably would not have known how it worked, unless Herodotus always issued a disclaimer along the lines of 'what follows is purely a work of fiction'. Otherwise we have to assume that some of his readers would have been taken in by his claims to have travelled to Egypt, spoken with the priests in Memphis or seen the pyramids as a genuine travelogue and investigation. After all, plenty of Greeks had visited Egypt in the seventh to fifth centuries BC.

[76] Fehling (1989) 240.

[77] Fehling (1989) 241.

[78] Fehling (1989) 155.

[79] Fehling (1989) 10.

[80] Fehling (1989) 96.

Yet – and this is the nub of the problem – Fehling does not believe Herodotus issued any such warning. On the contrary, he asserts that Herodotus did not want his readership to know that the *Histories* are largely a work of fiction. For example, he suggests that while Herodotus was free to invent objects such as the bronze bowl in far-away Scythia (4.81), he was more constrained closer to home, meaning that the Parnassus rocks at Delphi (8.39) are more likely genuine as this is a site no doubt familiar to many Greeks.[81]

Further, his interpretation (discussed above at p.41) of the use of imperfect verbs with the ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ phrase as an attempt on Herodotus' part to cover his back in case any of his readers should attempt to see for themselves these invented objects, also demonstrates he believes Herodotus is trying to conceal his deceit from his audience. Therefore, Fehling thinks on the one hand that Herodotus was not a fraud but a poet, but on the other hand that he wanted his audience to believe he had seen things which Fehling knows Herodotus did not see – a fraudulent practice by most people's definition. These two positions are inconsistent, and thus the internal logic of Fehling's overall picture of the *Histories* and their author is unsound. His analysis of the *Histories*' sources as largely fictive and its author as a man on a deliberate mission to deceive his readers unavoidably consigns Herodotus to sit among history's most elaborate tricksters, which for most scholars is simply not a satisfactory reading of the text.[82]

Armayor is another scholar who has cast serious doubt on Herodotus' credibility, using a series of articles to question whether he really visited the Black Sea, Egypt, and the region from Thrace through to the Levant.[83] But his work has been heavily

[81] Fehling (1989) 129.

[82] For further criticism of Fehling's approach, see Lateiner (1990b) noting that Fehling hardly looks at Herodotus' better sources for the Persian Wars; Bowden (1992) comments on Fehling's lack of interest in the nature of oral sources; Fowler (1996); Gray (2001) in relation to Arion and the dolphin (*Histories*, 1.23-4); Luraghi (2001b) 139-40: 'Fehling's tendency to operate with a quite unsophisticated concept of historical truth and to measure Herodotus by the standards of nineteenth-century historiography vitiates his analysis from beginning to end'; Luraghi also notes (143), *contra* Fehling, that Herodotus' source-citations are not in fact a particularly useful tool for him to convince his audience of the credibility of his narrative – he relies far more on *opsis* and *gnome*; Hornblower (2002) 379-80. The majority of scholars of classical historiography now reject Fehling's interpretation of Herodotus' methodology: see, for example, Champion in Litotsakis and Farrington (2016) 2.

[83] See Armayor (1978a), (1978b), (1978c), (1980) and (1985).

criticised by other scholars. Evans points out that Armayor's work refuting Herodotus' autopsy of the Egyptian labyrinth and Lake Moeris is based on outdated archaeological data for the area, ignores more recent research which supports Herodotus' account and provides little analysis on the date and structure of the labyrinth.[84] He also suggests a credible alternative interpretation of Herodotus' mistakes as regards Lake Moeris, following Gardiner's identification of the Egyptian word *mi-wer* to mean canal as well as lake to argue that Herodotus misunderstood the Egyptians when they told him that the *mi-wer* (i.e., canal) had been excavated.[85]

Armayor at times draws far-reaching conclusions about Herodotus' credibility from scant evidence. For example, he uses Herodotus' description of Colchians and Egyptians as μελάγχροές ... καὶ οὐλότριχες (2.104.2) as proof that Herodotus never visited the Black Sea region or Egypt at all. Armayor's argument is that as the phrase (in his translation) means 'black-skinned and woolly-haired', Herodotus is suggesting that the Colchians and Egyptians are black Africans. As no one who had actually seen a Colchian or Egyptian could think that, Herodotus had either never been to Colchis and Egypt or he misled his audience about these peoples' appearance because he thought they would expect there to be black Africans in these regions.[86] Armayor adds that based on Ionian geographic and ethnographic theories, Herodotus would have expected such people to be 'black' because the regions they lived in would mean they were burnt by the sun.

However, the description need not cause such difficulties. Liddell and Scott translate μελάγχροες as 'swarthy, of sun-burnt appearance' as well as 'black-

[84] Evans (1987) 638-9. He concludes: 'it is hard to find much to recommend in this book [Armayor (1985)]. It fails to prove its point, and it is not a reliable guide to recent research in the Fayoum area'. See also Lloyd (1988) 74 in relation to Herodotus' measurements of Cheops' and Chephren's pyramids: 'The doubts of Armayor on Herodotus' honesty in such contexts ... will justly acquire few supporters'.

[85] Evans (1963) 276-7. Evans argues that there is some evidence to suggest that Pharaoh Moeris (i.e., Ahmenemhet III) increased the water levels in the lake by widening the canal which brought water from the Nile. The earth from these excavations was then used to create barrages on the Nile – hence Herodotus' slight misunderstanding that the earth from the excavated lake had been dumped in the Nile.

[86] Armayor (1978a) 60; (1980) 64-5; (1978b) 61-3.

skinned', and they translate οὐλότριχες as 'to have curly hair'.[87] Powell also translates these adjectives as 'swarthy' and 'curly-haired'.[88] If Herodotus is merely saying that the Colchians and Egyptians are of sun-burnt appearance and have curly hair, his description is not so bizarre for an eyewitness, especially if he is describing them in relation to the Greeks – there is no need to think they are black Africans. Lloyd agrees that there is 'no linguistic justification' for interpreting this description in the way that Armayor does.[89]

But strangely, despite his doubts about Herodotus, Armayor also at times draws back from following his arguments through to their logical conclusion. For example, he seriously undermines all Herodotus' claims to autopsy in the Black Sea region, but then concludes 'we can only remain agnostic on the extent of [Herodotus' experience of the Black Sea]', rightly pointing out that once his autopsy has been questioned 'we hardly know when to stop', an argument he reiterates in his criticism of Herodotus' Egyptian account.[90] It is almost as though he is troubled by the Pandora's box effect of his conclusions on the rest of the text and thus at times comes across as unconvinced by the consequences of his own arguments.

Yet Fehling and Armayor's work should not be dismissed altogether: it is undoubtedly true that problems remain over Herodotus' credibility, whether his inaccuracies are due to mistakes, memory lapses, unreliable sources or even occasional invention – the author is, after all, only human, and was writing at a time when historiography was still developing as a genre. Moreover, scholars such as Pritchett who sit at the other end of the spectrum at times exhibit a rather too

[87] Liddell and Scott (1996 edn) 1094 and 1271.

[88] Powell (1938) 218 and 277.

[89] Lloyd (1988) 22: μελάγχροές can denote any colour from bronzed to black; given our lack of knowledge concerning the ethnic composition of the Colchians in the fifth century BC, 'we should not dismiss Herodotus' description out of hand … he, or his sources, may well have generalized from a section of the population which happened to show physical characteristics reminiscent of the Egyptians and, therefore, provided some measure of support for the theory of the Egyptian origin of the Colchians as a whole'; see also Lloyd (2002) 420: 'clearly we must allow here for a Greek concept of the "symbolic" Egyptian'.

[90] Armayor (1978a) 62; see also (1978b) 70: 'for once we retreat from the face value of Herodotus' narrative, how do we know where to stop?'

dogged determination to prove that every autopsy reference is genuine and any inaccuracies or inconsistencies can always be fully explained.

Between these two extremes are scholars such as Marincola, Luraghi, Thomas and Lateiner, who have tried to navigate a more moderate course through this scholarly battlefield and attempted more subtle interpretations of Herodotus' work (see discussion of Luraghi and Marincola's approach to Fehling above). They have tried to move away from the obsession with pure credibility, rejecting the use of a modern idea of accuracy in historical research as being a valid way to judge the text.

This more nuanced approach is surely the best, appreciating that Herodotus was operating in a fifth-century BC world which did not necessarily have our concept of 'truth', and before the invention of 'history' or the tools to implement an accurate historical method. It is also more aligned with the probable expectations of his audience, for whom Herodotus' methodology would likely have been fairly radical. These scholars have further appreciated Herodotus' enormous contribution to the writing of history, being most deserving of his 'father of history' title for his historical research methods and endlessly inquisitive spirit rather than the accuracy or otherwise of his narrative.

Yet given the gulf between those at the two extremes of this debate, it is worth examining in detail the credibility of a few of Herodotus' autopsy references to see if a more considered approach might advance our position. I have chosen those that are particularly controversial and for which new or additional solutions might be proposed.

4.81.2-4

This passage concerns the Scythian bronze bowl made out of arrowheads which represents the size of the Scythian population. Herodotus tells us it had a 600-amphora capacity, was six fingers thick and six times bigger than the bowl set up by Pausanias at the mouth of the Euxine Sea. Herodotus was apparently shown the bowl in the Exampaeus region (τοσόνδε μέντοι ἀπέφαινόν μοι ἐς ὄψιν) and offers

to describe it to his readers in case any of them have not seen Pausanias' bowl (ὃς δὲ μὴ εἶδέ κω τοῦτον, ὧδε δηλώσω – 4.81.4).[91]

However, not all scholars believe this is a claim to autopsy. West finds the imperfect ἀπέφαινόν strange and suggests a different translation ('they indicated this much to me by way of illustration') in line with her conservative approach to Herodotus' travels in Scythia.[92] In other words, Herodotus is not saying he saw the bowl, but merely that it was mentioned to him as evidence. But as Corcella points out, [ἀπέφαινόν] λόγῳ would then be expected, while the offer to describe the bowl for those who have not seen Pausanias' sounds like a claim to personal observation. Corcella still feels, though, that the phrase (lit.) 'they brought forward to my sight this much' is strange. [93]

Perhaps this is one of Herodotus' less conventional autopsy references, but surely the point here is that a contrast is being made with the previous sentence. Herodotus is on a mission to discover the size of the Scythian population, but without much success as his oral sources keep disagreeing with one another: ἀλλὰ διαφόρους λόγους περὶ τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ ἤκουον: καὶ γὰρ κάρτα πολλοὺς εἶναί σφεας καὶ ὀλίγους ὡς Σκύθας εἶναι. τοσόνδε μέντοι ἀπέφαινόν μοι ἐς ὄψιν ('but I kept hearing many different stories about the number. For some said there were great numbers of Scythians and others that there were few of them. But *this much* was demonstrated to me before my eyes' [emphasis added]).

What Herodotus is doing here is drawing a contrast between two sources, *akoe* and *opsis* (the ἤκουον and ὄψιν above). The oral sources could not give him a satisfactory answer, but *opsis* provided him with some sort of information – a contrast made by the word μέντοι. So what Herodotus really means by τοσόνδε

---

[91] See Steiner (1994) 177-8 for discussion of this episode in the context of the commemorative nature of the bowl for a nation; Dewald (1993) 56 n.1 on the bowl as an example of the connection in the *Histories* between significant objects, sight and wonder; Sergueenkova (2016) on the bowl in the context of Herodotus' interest in methods of calculating large numbers, especially visual measures, which are 'essential to Herodotus' method of using the physical traces of the past as a way of reconstructing antiquity' (124).

[92] West (2004) 78; see also West (2003) 151-2 for her comments on Herodotus' measurements of the Euxine sea.

[93] Corcella (2007) 640. Smith (1987) 135, n.15 agrees that the offer to describe the bowl 'surely means that Herodotus has seen the krater'.

μέντοι ἀπέφαινόν μοι ές ὄψιν is that the oral reports are inconclusive, 'but this much I can be sure about'. This can only be fully appreciated when the passage is considered within the context of the text as a whole.

As will be explored in the next chapter, Herodotus frequently contrasts information acquired through *akoe* which is usually less reliable, with that gained through *opsis*, a surer guarantee of the truth. 2.148 is probably the best example of this, where Herodotus contrasts the subterranean rooms of the Egyptian labyrinth which he has only heard about, with the upper rooms which he has seen for himself. 4.81 is thus another passage which is part of this pattern.

If such a contrast underlies 4.81, then the phrase τοσόνδε μέντοι ἀπέφαινόν μοι ές ὄψιν must be an indication of autopsy. As for the imperfect tense (ἀπέφαινόν), the meaning 'they repeatedly pointed out to me' is not so strange. It follows on from the imperfect in the previous sentence (ἤκουον) and together the two verbs give a sense of many insistent voices each giving their own opinion on the question. Nevertheless, there are still difficulties with taking this passage as a genuine autopsy reference. Fehling for one finds the size of the bowl 'several orders of magnitude beyond anything conceivable' and Armayor agrees that Herodotus' figures are impossible.[94]

A 600-amphora capacity does seem rather large, although it is no bigger than the silver bowl dedicated by Croesus at Delphi which Herodotus saw and claimed was used at the Theophania festival as a mixing-bowl (1.51.3), albeit that bronze needs to be cast while silver can be hammered in separate pieces which are then welded together. And while Exampaeus was a region Herodotus could not expect many of his fellow Greeks to have visited, the dedications at Delphi were likely known to many of them. Pritchett argues that such a capacity is not at all unfeasible: there is epigraphic evidence that the silver bowl at Delphi was used at the Theoxenia festival (he suggests Herodotus or the scribe made a slip in the spelling of the festival's name)[95] as it had to be repaired in the fourth century, while there is a

[94] Fehling (1989) 223; Armayor (1978a) 50-57: 'he did not see what he says he did on the basis of the evidence now in hand'. Cf. a slightly different approach from Dewald (1987) 159: although she agrees that Herodotus saw the bowl, she feels that this episode demonstrates the limits of *opsis* as 'he cannot translate this knowledge into a concrete, communicable reality in words and numbers'.

[95] Alternatively, Parke (1984) 211 n.4 suggests the bowl could have been used at both festivals.

report from Kallixeinos that a bowl of the same size was paraded in the procession of Ptolemy Philadelphos.[96] Further, the use of weapons as a method of counting men is recorded by Procopius as a custom practised by the Persians.[97] Brown is another scholar who believes Herodotus really did see the Exampaeus bowl.[98]

Bowls with 600-amphorae capacities may or may not have existed in the ancient world, but another solution to consider is that Herodotus' figure is simply wrong.[99] His measurements throughout the *Histories* are notoriously inaccurate – hardly surprising in an age with few methods available for taking precise readings. As Corcella suggests 'he probably furnished a rough estimate, which was exaggerated and based on sexagesimal numeration'.[100]

Fehling points out that the numbers 6, 60, and 600 are used with 'astonishing regularity' for mixing-bowls in the text and sees this as evidence of fiction.[101] Instead it may be part of a scale by which Herodotus attempted to estimate the size of these bowls. It should be no surprise that such rough estimates are given as round numbers. In the absence of anything that seriously undermines the credibility of this autopsy reference it seems more reasonable to accept that Herodotus is telling the truth unless he can be shown to be lying, than assume with Fehling that he is lying unless he can be shown to be telling the truth.[102]

---

[96] *FrGrHist* 627 [Kallixeinos] frg. 2.

[97] Procopius, *History of the Wars*, I.18; Pritchett (1993) 133-7.

[98] Brown (1988) 69.

[99] See Blackman and Sawyer (2000) for a scientific analysis of the 600-amphora silver bowl dedicated by Croesus at Delphi (*Histories*, 1.51.1-2). They conclude that while such a bowl would have remained intact once filled if made of bronze, this is much less likely for one made of gold (note, however, that for some reason Blackman and Sawyer understand the 600-amphorae description to apply to the gold bowl dedicated by Croesus, whereas in fact it is clear from the text that it refers to the silver – ὁ δὲ ἀργύρεος ἐπὶ τοῦ προνηίου τῆς γωνίης, χωρέων ἀμφορέας ἑξακοσίους). They suggest that the acrophonic representation for the capacity figure (if used) could easily have been mistranscribed by a scribe given that the symbols for 600 and 60 are very similar.

[100] Corcella (2007) 641. See also Wallace (2016) 169 on Herodotus' use of formulaic numbers.

[101] Fehling (1989) 223.

[102] See also Lloyd (1976) 117 in relation to Herodotus' travels to Elephantine at 2.29.1: 'nowhere is it possible to prove that Herodotus was a liar and until such a demonstration is forthcoming we have no alternative but to accept his good faith'.

2.75.1

In a passage that has caused great puzzlement among scholars, Herodotus describes how he travelled to a mountain pass between Egypt and Arabia near Buto to learn more about winged snakes which he was told (λόγος ... ἐστι – 2.75.3) invade Egypt from Arabia every year but are caught and killed by ibises in the pass. There he saw 'bones and spines of snakes' (ἀπικόμενος δὲ εἶδον ὀστέα ὀφίων καὶ ἀκάνθας) which he appears to take as confirmation of the story. As no such winged snakes existed, this episode rather undermines Herodotus' credibility. Numerous solutions have been suggested: the story actually refers to the cobra, worshipped as the goddess Wadjet at Buto and often represented pictorially as a winged snake; or the creatures are locusts, winged lizards or horned vipers which can fling themselves through the air.[103]

There is one important point to note, however, which is that Herodotus carefully distinguishes between what he has heard (the story about *winged* snakes) and what he has seen ('bones and spines of snakes'), i.e., the winged element is based on hearsay alone. This distinction has been picked up by many including How and Wells ('Herodotus simply says he saw a number of snake bones piled up, the rest of the story is what he was *told*'), Lloyd, West and Clarke.[104] This means there are really two separate issues here. Fehling finds the coincidence of the story with a confirmatory stack of bones too good to be true: the locals would have known winged snakes did not exist and had there been such a visible phenomenon it would have been recorded by other travellers.[105]

But it is not difficult to imagine how a story about local creatures, whether they be locusts, cobras or winged lizards, might have been corrupted in translation, with Herodotus misunderstanding his interpreter, or that the formula 'winged snakes' was the best approximation he could get. More problematic are the bones which Herodotus saw. Even his stauncher supporters are troubled: 'Herodotus clearly saw something which could be taken for snake skeletons but what it was is a

[103] Lloyd (1976) 326-7.

[104] How and Wells (1912) 204; Lloyd (1976) 326; West (1985) 294; Clarke (2018) 140.

[105] Fehling (1989) 25-7.

complete mystery' comments Lloyd.[106] West too feels that although 'it is not difficult to account for Herodotus' belief that flying snakes were to be found in Egypt ... it is impossible to suggest what he might have seen that he could reasonably have mistaken for heaps of snake skeletons ... snakes do not congregate to die'.[107]

It certainly appears to be the case, as Braun has argued, that what Herodotus saw were the bones of ordinary wingless snakes and he would not have expected to see traces of the wings which would have consisted of membranes and tiny bones.[108] Pritchett suggests a different solution: ὀστέα can mean 'remains' or 'bodies', so Herodotus could be seeing the remains of locusts which do in fact invade Egypt from Arabia each Spring and are eaten by ibises.[109]

This is an ingenious solution, but it is still problematic that Herodotus should describe the remains of locusts as 'snakes'. If we wish to maintain that Herodotus really did see this pile of snake bones then only two possible solutions remain: either, as Braun suggests, the bones had been placed there by the locals deliberately as a θώμα or 'leg-pull' to impress gullible visitors such as Herodotus;[110] or there is in fact a natural explanation for the bones – of course snakes do not 'congregate to die' but piles of animal bones are often found near the homes of their predators. If a colony of birds which ate snakes lived in this mountain pass, then piles of bones there are not so unexpected. This would then provide a reasonable explanation for what Herodotus saw.

6.74.2 and 9.81.1

These two passages refer to phenomena in Greece (one natural, one manmade) which Herodotus appears to have seen. The first is a detailed description of the source of the River Styx in Arcadia which is fed by snows from Mount Chelmos and comes down a sheer face of rock for approximately 200 metres, forming the only

[106] Lloyd (1976) 327; he summarises the various different theories proffered by scholars to explain this phenomenon.

[107] West (1985) 294 n.72.

[108] Braun (2004) 279.

[109] Pritchett (1993) 28-9.

[110] Braun (2004) 280-1.

waterfall on the mainland. Herodotus describes (in the present tense) how in the town of Nonacris a trickle of water drips out of a rock and into a basin which has been encircled by a wall (ὕδωρ ὀλίγον φαινόμενον ἐκ πέτρης στάζει ἐς ἄγκος, τὸ δὲ ἄγκος αἰμασιῆς τις περιθέει κύκλος). Some have argued that Herodotus did not in fact see this water feature himself but may have been drawing on a lost passage of Hecataeus (who is mentioned directly at 6.137), not least because he makes no explicit mention of having seen it.[111]

But a close examination of the text suggests otherwise. Herodotus is told by the Arcadians that the waters of the Styx are to be found in Nonacris (λέγεται ... ὑπ' Ἀρκάδων), but he separates this oral source from the statement about the waterfall with the phrase καὶ δὴ καὶ ἔστι τοιόνδε τι ('and what is more this is really the case ...'). This phrase is then followed by the description of the water that 'appears from the rock' (φαινόμενον ἐκ πέτρης). It seems clear that a contrast is being drawn between two sources, *akoe* (the water is part of the River Styx), and *opsis* (the description of water falling from the rock). The visual evidence is presented as confirming the oral source as indicated by the καὶ δὴ καὶ phrase. This interpretation is supported by the broader pattern which can be observed in the *Histories* of Herodotus using *opsis* as a check on *akoe* to refute, confirm or add to the evidence it provides, as can be seen, for example, at 2.131 or 4.81.4 (discussed above).[112]

There is another indication that Herodotus really did see the spring at Nonacris. The flow of water down the rock there varies throughout the year and during the summer it becomes a trickle of water or dries up altogether. If Herodotus' source of information had been entirely oral (the Arcadians) or written, it is likely he would have known about this variation; the detailed information about the Nile floods in Book 2 shows he was interested in the water level changes of rivers. But Herodotus describes the waterfall as ὕδωρ ὀλίγον ('a little water' / 'a trickle') which sounds more like a description from someone who has made a personal observation of the fall on a single day at one time of year, perhaps late summer.

[111] See Scott (2005) 290.

[112] Hornblower and Pelling (2017) 186 do not commit themselves as to whether Herodotus went to the 'visitable' site, but note his use of λέγεται to distance himself from mythological material (waters of the Styx).

These two factors provide a strong indication that Herodotus did visit Nonacris and his description of the waterfall comes directly from his own autopsy.

At 9.81.1 Herodotus describes the famous bronze serpent column supporting a golden tripod which was dedicated by the Greeks at Delphi after the battle of Plataea and stands very close to the altar (ἐπεστεώς). The tripod was melted down by the Phocians during their occupation of Delphi in the Third Sacred War, but the column with its three snakes was taken to Constantinople in the fourth century AD by Constantine and still remains there (though the snakes are without their heads – one survives in the museum in Istanbul), so for once we have a good control for the information Herodotus provides. There are two aspects which trouble Herodotus' critics. The first is that in an earlier passage (8.82.1) he says that the names of those who fought at Plataea were inscribed 'on the tripod' (ἐς τὸν τρίποδα) whereas in fact they are on the coils of the snakes. In addition, Herodotus omits to mention seven of the names inscribed there. Secondly, Herodotus describes the column supporting the tripod as a 'three-headed serpent' (τοῦ τρικαρήνου ὄφιος) when it actually consists of three individual snakes.[113]

These inconsistencies prompt West to suggest that Herodotus' knowledge of the monument 'rests more on hearsay than independent study'.[114] But Pritchett has proposed reasonable explanations for both inconsistencies. He argues that the phrase ἐς τὸν τρίποδα refers to the monument in its entirety, not just the tripod, and finds support in the fact that Thucydides also refers to it in this way (*Peloponnesian War*, 1.132.1). As for the snakes, he points out that just by looking at the 'coiled mass' face on one can see how easily it could be taken for a single snake, and that several modern commentators (from How and Wells to Macan) have made the same mistake.[115]

---

[113] For a description of the serpent column, its inscription and bibliography see ML 57-60; also Fornara 58. Thirty-one city-states are mentioned and thus the monument seems to refer to those who fought in the Persian Wars generally up to but not including Mykale, not just the battle of Plataea. Some of names (the Tenians and the Siphnians) appear to have been added later. See also Liddel and Low (2013b) 11-12.

[114] West (1985) 281.

[115] Pritchett (1993) 147-8.

Asheri agrees that the mistake is understandable and insufficient to doubt the autopsy of two ancient authors who were both connoisseurs of Delphi (Pausanias had made the same mistake regarding the three snakes in his description of the monument [*Periegesis*, X.13]). The omission of the seven names is also justifiable: the same list of participants in the battle was inscribed on the right-hand side of the base of the statue of Zeus at Olympia and was still legible by Pausanias, but it appears that only half of the Olympia list followed the same order of the list at Delphi, therefore providing evidence that even immediately after the battle there was no single agreed list.[116] Meiggs and Lewis point out that Pausanias (V.23) also only records twenty-seven names of the thirty-one inscribed at Olympia, suggesting this was simply due to his negligence or that of a later copyist.[117]

To these arguments can be added a couple of additional points supporting Herodotus' credibility. First, Delphi must have been one of the best known and most visited sites in Greece and the serpent column one of its most important and prominent monuments. Many of Herodotus' readers would have been familiar with it so it would be necessary to get the description right. As so many people could have told him what it looked like, any mistakes in the description such as the three-headed snake seem more likely to be the result of personal observation: one man might make the mistake but it would be extraordinary if every visitor did so.

Secondly, Delphi was one of the most crucial sites for the exercise of Herodotus' autopsy – it receives more autopsy references than any other location (see Appendix B). There can be little doubt that he visited the temple there and even West agrees it would be 'perverse' to suggest he did not see the serpent column at all.[118] Moreover, memorials set up to commemorate Greek victories and sacrifices in the Persian War are clearly vital to Herodotus' account: there are nine autopsy references for such monuments of which four were at Delphi.[119] These factors add

[116] Asheri (2006) 284-5: 'le omissioni sono in un modo o nell'altro giustificabili'. Asheri states that the two lists must have been drawn up immediately after the victory, probably in 478/7 BC. This would fit with ML's conclusion that the monument covers victories only up to and including Plataea.

[117] ML 59.

[118] West (1985) 281.

[119] Delphi: 8.39.2; 8.121.2; 8.122; 9.81.1. Others: 7.225.2; 7.228; 8.121.1; 9.70.3; 9.85.3.

up to provide overwhelming evidence that Herodotus did indeed see the Greek memorial commemorating the battle of Plataea.

The discussion above of a few of the more controversial autopsy references in the *Histories* illustrates how Herodotus' honesty and integrity as an eyewitness can be upheld. This is not the same as saying that he is always a reliable guide to the phenomena he has seen: hampered by the absence of equipment and a lack of foreign languages, he often provides inaccurate measurements and orientation for monuments, and may also have suffered from memory lapses, misunderstandings with locals and even the temptation to embellish or enlarge upon certain descriptions and statistics to add to the 'marvellous' quality of his narrative. Yet his mistakes appear to be honest ones and even if he can be found guilty of exaggeration on occasion, this does not prove that his autopsy is invented – he may still have seen something.

The question of Herodotus' credibility will probably never be fully resolved to the satisfaction of all scholars, not least because the main protagonists in this debate are too entrenched in their positions. As Fehling says in his discussion of Herodotus' autopsy of Elephantine and Thebes, 'this man has never been to Upper Egypt, even if a conceivable explanation can be found for every statement he makes'.[120] In the end, we cannot know for a fact that Herodotus definitely saw all the phenomena he claims to have seen, whether explicitly or implicitly. The question is a matter of judgement for the individual reader of the text, using the maximum external evidence available for monuments or geographical features and getting a feel for the author's personality which is communicated so strongly throughout the work. In other words it is ultimately a matter for belief rather than knowledge.

Ultimately, Herodotus' credibility is not a crucial issue to settle in the context of this study which is concerned with the methodology underlying his investigation. Whether or not Herodotus really saw all the things he claims to have seen, what is very clear from the discussion above is that he was keen that his audience should

[120] Fehling (1989) 242.

believe he had done so. The reasons why it was so important for Herodotus to put his autopsy on display will now be investigated.

Chapter 3
Opsis in the Metanarrative:
Herodotus' Uses of Autopsy

μέχρι μὲν τούτου ὄψις τε ἐμὴ καὶ γνώμη καὶ ἱστορίη ταῦτα λέγουσα ἐστί, τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦδε Αἰγυπτίους ἔρχομαι λόγους ἐρέων κατὰ τὰ ἤκουον: προσέσται δὲ τι αὐτοῖσί καὶ τῆς ἐμῆς ὄψιος

'Up to this point my account of Egypt has been governed by my own observation, judgement and enquiry; but from now on I will be relating Egyptian accounts, although this will be supplemented by what I personally saw'

Histories, 2.99.1

3.1: Introduction

This programmatic statement which divides Herodotus' Egyptian account into two parts, a synchronic description of Egyptian landscape and customs and a chronological historical account, is one of the most controversial in modern Herodotean scholarship. What seems at first to be a simple explanation of the sources used becomes something of a puzzle on further reflection: it is not in fact the case that *opsis*, *gnome* and *historie* appear only before 2.99 while *akoe* (supplemented by *opsis*) only appears after 2.99, as Herodotus claims.

Furthermore, in the proem and elsewhere in the text, *historie* appears to be an all-encompassing term used to describe the whole work (ἱστορίης ἀπόδεξις), yet here it is listed as just another source. Indeed, in these couple of short sentences, Herodotus provides his audience with a complete list of his 'sources' – sight, opinion, enquiry, hearsay – but gives us very little indication (at least on first reading) of how they relate to one other or which (if any) is most important.

Scholars have traditionally seen this passage as providing the dividing line in Book 2 between an account of Egyptian geography and ethnography in the first half, and an account of Egyptian history in the second (thus reinforcing the idea that *opsis*, *gnome* and *historie* are more relevant to a contemporaneous, ethnographical

investigation and *akoe* to an historical one).[1] But while this may be broadly true, there are instances of historical material in the first half (e.g., the origins of Heracles) and geographic in the second (e.g., the investigation into Lake Moeris and the island of Chemmis) and in any case it is not always possible to draw such a rigid distinction between what is historical and what ethnographical material.

The complexities which lie just beneath the surface of the statement at 2.99 are symptomatic of the further intricacies in the relationship between different sources throughout the text. The aim of this chapter is to establish the role and purpose of *opsis* in the metanarrative of the *Histories* by using the database of autopsy references. What kind of a tool is *opsis* for Herodotus, what does it really add to his enquiry? How and why does he want his audience to perceive its use?

But prior and essential to answering any of these questions is an examination of the relationship between *opsis* and the other sources in the text. In the previous chapter, it was suggested that one purpose of *opsis* is as a check on other sources, to confirm, add to or refute the information which they provide, and this chapter will consider that proposition in more detail.[2] It will be vital to establish Herodotus' approach to different sources, and whether there is a clear hierarchy, as some, such as Marincola, have suggested, in order to pinpoint the overall status of *opsis* in Herodotus' investigative method.[3] This will then serve as a basis for exploring its wider role and purpose in the metanarrative, and the significance (if any) of the rich variety of *opsis* vocabulary and the distribution of autopsy references in the text and in different geographical locations.

3.2: The Significance of the Methodological Statements

One of the most striking features of the methodological statement at 2.99 is that the sources listed as important to the first half of the book – *opsis*, *gnome*, *historie* – are the subject of the sentence (as has been noted by some scholars).[4] It is difficult

[1] See Lloyd (1975) 84ff. and (2007) 227-8.

[2] As Lloyd (1975) 78 points out, autopsy can be regarded as closer to the truth than *akoe* because the information obtained is processed only by one mind rather than two or more.

[3] Marincola (1997) 96.

[4] See for example Luraghi (2006) 76; Schepens (1975) 260, (1980) 55 and (2007) 44: he describes these sources as 'the active faculties of the historian'.

to reflect this in a translation and most fail to do so (perhaps 'up to this point my own observation, judgement and enquiry have driven this account') and thus the full force of this sentence structure is often lost. But it is unusual and, I would argue, significant that Herodotus chooses to make his perceptive and cognitive faculties (rather than himself) the subject, thus creating a very vivid picture of their active role in the text – almost as though they are live forces directing Herodotus' investigations.

Herodotus makes a similar statement at 2.29.1 where he is exploring Egyptian geography:

> ἀλλὰ τοσόνδε μὲν ἄλλο ἐπὶ μακρότατον ἐπυθόμην, μέχρι μὲν Ἐλεφαντίνης πόλιος αὐτόπτης ἐλθών, τὸ δ' ἀπὸ τούτου ἀκοῇ ἤδη ἱστορέων
>
> However, I myself travelled as far as Elephantine seeing things with my very own eyes, and subsequently I made enquiries of others through oral accounts, from which the very most I could find out is as follows.

Here Herodotus as the subject of the sentence describes himself making enquiries (ἱστορέων) by collecting oral accounts (ἀκοῇ) and as an eyewitness (αὐτόπτης), this time merging his investigative powers with himself yet still making a powerful statement about his active faculties which are guiding the direction of the narrative.[5]

By contrast, at 2.147.1 Herodotus takes a less active role, allowing his informants to become the subject and changing the noun (ἀκοὴ) to a verb (λέγουσι):

> ταῦτα μέν νυν αὐτοὶ Αἰγύπτιοι λέγουσι, ὅσα δὲ οἵ τε ἄλλοι ἄνθρωποι καὶ Αἰγύπτιοι λέγουσι ὁμολογέοντες τοῖσι ἄλλοισι κατὰ ταύτην τὴν χώρην γενέσθαι, ταῦτ' ἤδη φράσω: προσέσται δέ τι αὐτοῖσι καὶ τῆς ἐμῆς ὄψιος
>
> So far this is what the Egyptians say; but from now on I will report what other people as well as the Egyptians say about this country; but this will be further supplemented by my own *opsis*.

[5] See Lloyd (1976) 115-17 for a detailed analysis of this passage, including strong arguments that Herodotus did in fact travel as far as Elephantine, despite the doubts of some scholars.

Interestingly, *opsis* remains as a noun, the independent nature of Herodotus' investigative sources coming back to the fore at this point.

But to understand the exact role of *opsis* in relation to his other sources, we should first try to establish the meaning and purpose of the other sources listed at 2.99.

3.2.1: Historie *and its relationship with* akoe

At first it seems rather odd to find *historie* listed alongside other sources such as *opsis* and *akoe*.[6] This is largely because in the opening statement at the beginning of the *Histories* where Herodotus lays out the programme and purpose of his great work, he uses the word to describe his project as a whole, rather than just one contributory source or method: it is a ἱστορίης ἀπόδεξις, an exposition of his enquiry. He uses it again in this sense at 7.96.1 when he explains that he is not going to give the names of the naval officers who commanded Xerxes' fleet because this is not required by the 'account of my enquiry' (ἱστορίης λόγον).

Yet in the only other two places in which the noun appears in the text, it is used to describe the enquiries the Egyptian priests made of Menelaus about his Trojan adventures (2.118.1 and 2.119.3). Where Herodotus uses the verb ἱστορέω to describe his own activities, he means it either to refer to specific questions put to individuals (for example, when he questions the priests about Helen at 2.113) or more broadly to the investigations he has made into a particular topic (on the course of the Nile at 2.34.1 (ἱστορεῦντα) or the fauna in the part of Libya where the nomadic tribes live – ἱστορέοντες – 4.192.3).[7]

So it would appear that *historie* has at least two meanings in the text: a very broad one which encompasses Herodotus' whole project and all his investigative methods (*opsis*, *akoe*, *gnome*);[8] but also a more specific one to refer to the process of interrogating his informants (i.e., collecting oral accounts through questioning). Scholars have tried to bridge this tension between the two meanings: Schepens

[6] See Connor (1993) for a discussion of the meaning of *historie*. He notes (3) that the most likely root, *wid-*, denotes both wisdom and knowledge and so suggests *historie* is the process of attaining knowledge as a result of 'looking into things'.

[7] See also 2.19.3 (twice), 2.29.1, 2.44.5.

[8] In this meaning Lloyd (1975) 82-3 has noted that the use of *historie* in the proem 'constitutes an emphatic statement of Herodotus' autonomy in the collection of material'.

describes *historie* as personal research in the broadest sense – interrogating informants to obtain the testimony of eyewitnesses and *epichoroi*;[9] Luraghi appreciates that the word at 2.99 clearly indicates something different from seeing and reasoning, yet is very much connected with its use in the proem describing the primary activity of research of which *opsis*, *gnome* and *akoe* are a part.[10]

However others argue for the broader meaning alone: Fowler sees *historie* as a 'self-conscious intellectual activity' which Herodotus has chosen to apply to human actions and events, as well as geographical and natural phenomena, because the natural environment helps to shape human behaviour, although Fowler also draws attention to the fact that it includes an element of judgement (*histor* means 'judge');[11] Munson describes it as 'the process (and the product) of collecting evidence by seeing what is possible to see and by hearing the available verbal testimony';[12] Gehrke underlines the importance of *historie* being a preference for one's own research in which of course autopsy pays a vital role;[13] Lloyd simply notes that it is 'an instrument for discovering the truth'.[14]

But how does *historie* in its narrower sense, making enquiries of informants, differ from *akoe* (hearsay / oral reports)? Some scholars suggest that we should see them as symbiotic, as two parts of the same process: whereas *historie* is the activity by which one questions potential informants to elicit information, *akoe*

---

[9] Schepens (1975) 261.

[10] Luraghi (2006) 78. See also Bakker (2002) 15: '*Historie*, then, seems to be looking through the eyes of one's informants and making up for their imperfect point of view by the power of judgment and discrimination' – for Bakker the key is that it denotes knowledge based on the assessment of others' perceptions and experiences (16); however this does not account for the role played by Herodotus' autopsy in his investigation.

[11] Fowler (2006) 29-31; also Connor (1993) 9: 'the patterns of arbitration associated with the word *histor* provide a powerful metaphor for intellectual activities including the rigorous examination of evidence, choosing between conflicting claims and versions, assessing responsibility, and the consequent building of a consensus within a community'.

[12] Munson (2001) 7.

[13] Gehrke (2010) 25. He also emphasises the importance of tangible and personally verifiable evidence for an historical investigation in the context of the aftermath of the Persian Wars when there were so many different versions of recent history and a need for explanations for recent events. See also Fritz (1936) 315 on *historie* indicating knowledge acquired through personal experience.

[14] Lloyd (1975) 83.

describes the product of those enquiries, the oral reports which the questioner receives as a result – in other words they are the active and passive parts of a single investigative process.[15] The passive nature of *akoe* for the recipient is reflected in the fact that it is the only source at 2.99.1 which does not appear as the subject: Herodotus will merely report the Egyptian accounts which he has heard (Αἰγυπτίους ἔρχομαι λόγους ἐρέων κατὰ τὰ ἤκουον). This also chimes with his protest later in the text that he only reports what he has heard and this should not be taken as a sign that he necessarily believes these accounts (2.123.1; 7.152.3).

By contrast, *historie* comes with an element of adjudication: the *histor* is 'no longer a passive receiver of information, [he] travels, wants to know, participates in interviews, collects hearsay, verifies by autopsy'.[16] This is illustrated by Herodotus' investigation into the origins of Heracles: he collects and analyses the evidence gained through *akoe*, *gnome* and *opsis* before he is satisfied, summing up the process as τὰ … ἱστορημένα (2.43-4). The connection, yet distinction, between *historie* and *akoe* is also encapsulated by Herodotus' statement at 2.29.1 where he tells us that he undertook research through oral report – τὸ δ' ἀπὸ τούτου ἀκοῇ ἤδη ἱστορέων. However, this formulation (enquiry via oral report) also implies that the activity of ἱστορέων can be carried out by other methods (e.g., *opsis*) therefore further hinting at the broader, all-encompassing meaning of the term as 'enquiries'.

We therefore ought to accept that Herodotus was content to let *historie* have a very flexible meaning, encompassing as it does the specific active enquiries of his informants, an overarching term to cover all his research methods (*opsis*, *akoe*, *gnome*), as well as a description of his whole magnum opus, the *Histories*. We should not, therefore, be troubled to find it listed alongside the other sources in 2.99.

[15] See, for example, Lloyd (2007) 230 who states that the two should be viewed together, but *historie* can be distinguished because it 'insists on the attempt of the aural recipient to acquire information by questioning'.

[16] Munson (2001) 35. See also Lateiner (1989) 225: *historie* is 'inquiry into past actions by investigation of written and living, oral sources'.

3.2.2: **Gnome**

The appearance of *gnome* (lit: opinion / judgement, but in this context best described as 'intelligent inference on the basis of personal experience'[17]) at 2.99 is surprising as we would not consider the historian's own subjective reasoning (even though based on the material he has collected) to be a source.[18] This prompts Schepens to suggest that 2.99 lists 'methods of research' rather than sources as such, which certainly makes *gnome* and *historie* sit more comfortably alongside *opsis* and *akoe*.[19] Herodotus applies *gnome* both to natural phenomena (e.g., the Nile – 2.19-28) and to historical questions (e.g., whether or not the Alcmeonidai betrayed the Greeks to the Persians at the battle of Marathon – 6.121-4). It is also clear that despite the statement at 2.99, instances of *gnome* can be found both before (2.18.1; 2.15.6; 2.43) and after (2.104; 2.116; 2.120; 2.135; 2.145-6) this supposed watershed.

One of the most frequent ways in which *gnome* is deployed in the text is to pass judgement on evidence from other sources, particularly when they conflict. This is apparent in Herodotus' discussion of the possible reasons for the summer flooding by the Nile where he dismisses three different Greek theories using rational arguments to disprove them, before advancing his own ideas which involve the sun changing its course in winter (2.24-5). Similarly, Herodotus judges that it was Ephialtes and not Onetas and Corydallus who revealed the secret mountain path to Thermopylae to the Persians, because it was Ephialtes who had a price put on his head by the Pylagori and was exiled for his betrayal (7.214). These are just two examples of how for Herodotus *gnome* describes a rational analytical process by which he may evaluate different theories (other people's *gnome*) about certain phenomena or accounts (*akoe*) of historical events. It is thus another kind of control on *akoe*.

Expressions of *gnome* by the narrator also contribute in large part to the polemical nature of the text. Naturally when Herodotus expresses a strong opinion on a

[17] Lloyd (1975) 140.

[18] As Corcella (1984) has noted, *gnome* is a tool to interpret the evidence gathered from *opsis*, *akoe* and *historie*.

[19] Schepens (1975) 264. For *gnome* in the narrative, where it more frequently refers to an expression of collective wisdom or "proverb", see Lang (1984) 58-67 and Shapiro (2000).

controversial topic he will be in opposition to other contemporary or earlier writers and thinkers such as Hecataeus. Often this is just implied, but occasionally Herodotus explicitly acknowledges the debate; for example, his belief that the Athenians deserve most of the credit for saving Greece from the Persian threat, which he describes as 'an opinion I am compelled to express and share, despite the fact that it will offend a great many people, because I believe it to be true' (ἐνθαῦτα ἀναγκαίῃ ἐξέργομαι γνώμην ἀποδέξασθαι ἐπίφθονον μὲν πρὸς τῶν πλεόνων ἀνθρώπων, ὅμως δὲ, τῇ γέ μοι φαίνεται εἶναι ἀληθὲς, οὐκ ἐπισχήσω – 7.139.1). In the context of growing Athenian hegemony, this would presumably have been a controversial and unpopular view.[20]

Thus *gnome* can be seen as encompassing quite a wide range of activities and subjects. Munson has described it as a compromise between 'being unable to tell' and knowledge.[21] This is correct in that *gnome* falls short of providing actual objective knowledge of a phenomenon or event. However, the strength of Herodotus' belief in its ability to aid the researcher in reaching the truth is better summed up by Raaflaub who describes it as rational argument based on empirical knowledge and probability:[22] it is the judgement of the available evidence by the intelligent and informed mind.

3.2.3: **Opsis**

As discussed later on in this chapter, *opsis* is the only source or method listed at 2.99 which is mentioned twice, in connection with both parts of Book 2. Few scholars appear to have noticed the importance of this.[23] West finds the repetition so troubling that she wonders if the statement προσέσται δὲ τι αὐτοῖσί καὶ τῆς ἐμῆς ὄψιος is a later addition to the text made by an over-zealous scribe.[24] It is true

[20] Herodotus' views on Athens, explored further in Chapter 5, have prompted much debate among scholars. See in particular Moles (2002) for a good summary of scholarship on this topic and Pelling (2009) on the complexities of Herodotus' presentation of Athenian virtues, including being saviours of the land in the context of autochthony (a defining concept for the Athenians) on which see also Shapiro (1998) for its visual representation at Athens.

[21] Munson (2001) 37.

[22] Raaflaub (2002) 159.

[23] Cartledge and Greenwood (2002) 335 are one exception.

[24] West (1985) 299; however, she also acknowledges the strength of the *opsis* principle at 2.99.

that this last clause seems a little out of place as it appears to unbalance the contrast being drawn between *opsis*, *gnome* and *historie* used pre 2.99 and *akoe* used post 2.99 (the principal μέν … δὲ clause).[25]

But what Herodotus is arguably doing here is deliberately upsetting the balance to draw attention to one particular source – *opsis*.[26] Taken together with the statement at 2.147.1, where Herodotus tells us that he will now be using the accounts of other people as well as the Egyptians but still supplemented by his own *opsis* (ταῦτα μέν νυν αὐτοὶ Αἰγύπτιοι λέγουσι, ὅσα δὲ οἵ τε ἄλλοι ἄνθρωποι καὶ Αἰγύπτιοι λέγουσι ὁμολογέοντες τοῖσι ἄλλοισι κατὰ ταύτην τὴν χώρην γενέσθαι, ταῦτ᾽ ἤδη φράσω: προσέσται δέ τι αὐτοῖσι καὶ τῆς ἐμῆς ὄψιος), we realise that *opsis* is the only source which he explicitly tells us he has used throughout all of his investigations in Book 2, and the second δέ (in the μέν … δὲ … δέ structure) emphasises this point.

Indeed, there are examples of Herodotus using all his different investigative methods both before and after 2.99 and so the distinction drawn there does not in fact hold good (see e.g., 2.104, 2.116, 2.120, 2.135, 2.145-6 for examples of *gnome* and 2.113 for *historie* post 2.99; 2.2-5, 2.32 for examples of *akoe* pre 2.99) although there is arguably a distinction of a different kind between a predominance of geographic and ethnographic material in 2.1-98 and historical material in 2.99-182.[27] Perhaps Herodotus intends to highlight which sources he found most useful for his enquiry pre and post 2.99, rather than to indicate a rigid distinction between sources as such.

For some reason he wants to give *opsis* an emphasis not afforded to the other sources – why is this? Of the other sources, *opsis* is most closely connected with *historie*: the root meaning of *historie* is actually 'to see' or 'to know' (from having

[25] There are, however, autopsy references both pre (eight) and post (twenty) 2.99; see Appendix A.

[26] See Chapter 6, section 6.3, where I argue that Herodotus' purpose in creating a rather awkward sentence structure here is to draw attention to the use of *opsis* for an historical as well as a geographical or ethnographical enquiry, possibly because this was a new idea at the time.

[27] Lloyd (1975) 88 notes that the reason *gnome* is highlighted by Herodotus as a source for 2.1-98 is that he is covering Egyptian tradition and thus would 'very rarely be in a position to judge its veracity'.

seen).[28] So in one sense at least, 'enquiry' means investigation through *opsis* or seeing for oneself. This together with the emphasis placed on *opsis* in the methodological statements suggests that Herodotus does view *opsis* as standing at the top of some sort of 'hierarchy of epistemological factors' and thus as providing the surest guarantee of accurate information, bringing us closer to knowledge.[29]

Many of the scholars who have considered Herodotus' use of sources would appear to agree with this conclusion;[30] but the relationship of *opsis* to the other sources can be better understood by a more detailed examination of the function of autopsy references in the text.

3.3: *Opsis* and its Relationship with Other Sources

Herodotus' authorial presence in the text of the *Histories* has been much commented on: he frequently interrupts the narrative to give the source of a particular story, describe his investigative activities, offer an opinion, or explain a digression. Dewald has counted 1,086 authorial first-person statements in the text; this is particularly striking because most ancient historiography remains in the third person and first-person intrusions are rare (as exemplified by Thucydides and Polybius).[31] These first-person statements form the metanarrative of the text and are how Herodotus attempts to establish his authority in relation to the narrative, to prove that his version of events is the correct one, as though the audience were constantly questioning his account.

---

[28] The verbal root *wid- /weid- / woid-*, as noted by Bakker (2002) 13 and Schepens (2007) 41.

[29] Marincola (1997) 96. See also Marincola (1987) 125: autopsy statements are 'a guarantee of the author's validation of the historical record'.

[30] See, for example, Dewald (1987) 157 on 2.29 and 2.99 evidencing Herodotus' belief that *opsis* is a more secure foundation for knowledge; Hedrick (1993) 23: 'Herodotus understands the visible and material as more trustworthy, more reliable, and more real than verbal sources'; Elsner (1994) 235: 'autopsy … is the device which guarantees an empirical truth-value'; Luraghi (2006) 78: *opsis* is the 'ultimate proof of truth'; Gehrke (2010) 25 on autopsy as the most important element of *historie*; Corcella (2013) 45: 'Herodotus makes vision his privileged source, because it is most trustworthy'.

[31] Dewald (1987) 154 n.19 and (2002) 271.

Part of this metanarrative discourse is the way in which Herodotus often meticulously distinguishes between sources. Probably the most notable example of this is at 2.148 where Herodotus describes the labyrinth near Lake Moeris:

> τὰ μέν νυν μετέωρα τῶν οἰκημάτων αὐτοί τε ὠρῶμεν διεξιόντες καὶ αὐτοὶ θεησάμενοι λέγομεν, τὰ δὲ αὐτῶν ὑπόγαια λόγοισι ἐπυνθανόμεθα … οὕτω τῶν μὲν κάτω περὶ οἰκημάτων ἀκοῇ παραλαβόντες λέγομεν, τὰ δὲ ἄνω μέζονα ἀνθρωπηίων ἔργων αὐτοὶ ὠρῶμεν
>
> I myself went through the ground-level rooms of the labyrinth so I speak with first-hand knowledge [lit: as one who has seen for myself], but the underground rooms were only described to me … so as far as the underground rooms are concerned I can only pass on what I was told, but those above ground which I personally saw appear to be superhuman edifices (2.148.5-6).

Here Herodotus has made it abundantly clear to his audience what information comes from which source – that concerning the upper rooms from *opsis*, and that for the underground rooms from *akoe*, as underlined by the repeated use of the contrasting μέν … δὲ phrase by which the distinction between *opsis* and *akoe* is drawn twice. Moreover that sense of personal guarantee is very much emphasised by the αὐτοί ('I [lit: we] *personally* saw') which is repeated with the verb for seeing on each of the three times the latter appears.[32] It is also evident that Herodotus considers that the information obtained through his own autopsy is more certain and reliable than that obtained through oral report alone – it allows him to speak as an eyewitness (αὐτοὶ θεησάμενοι λέγομεν) i.e., as someone with knowledge, and thus immediately bolsters his authority as a narrator in the eyes of his audience.[33]

[32] See Lloyd (1988) 120-4 on this passage, noting the strength of Herodotus' autopsy statements. See Purves (2010) 147-8 for discussion of the labyrinth in the context of maps and space in the *Histories*. Interestingly, Herodotus uses the first person plural here: did he perhaps tour the labyrinth with others?

[33] Note that this is the only example in the *Histories* where Herodotus uses the verb θεάομαι to describe his autopsy, perhaps underlining the wondrous nature of the labyrinth; *contra* Lightfoot (2003) 164 stating that Herodotus never uses this verb for his own sight-seeing.

A similar distinction can be found at 4.195 where Herodotus relates a story he has heard about how feathers coated in pitch are used to extract gold dust from a muddy pool on the island of Cyrauis:

> ταῦτα εἰ μὲν ἔστι ἀληθέως οὐκ οἶδα, τὰ δὲ λέγεται γράφω: εἴη δ᾽ ἂν πᾶν, ὅκου καὶ ἐν Ζακύνθῳ ἐκ λίμνης καὶ ὕδατος πίσσαν ἀναφερομένην αὐτὸς ἐγὼ ὥρων
>
> I do not know whether or not this story is true; I am only reporting what I was told. But it might be true, since I have personally seen pitch being brought out of the water to the surface of a pool in Zacynthos (4.195.2).

Once more, Herodotus carefully distinguishes between a story he has only heard and therefore cannot personally vouch for, and information he has obtained through his own autopsy (again note the emphasis on his personal guarantee, this time also with the pronoun – αὐτὸς ἐγὼ ὥρων). He places the evidence from different sources before his audience and allows them to make up their own minds. Much can also be inferred from this passage about Herodotus' views on the link between *opsis* or *akoe* and knowledge, and the didactic nature of his metanarrative, discussed below.

There are other passages in the text where Herodotus' careful citation of sources is on display.[34] What this meticulous approach allows him to do is to pit sources against one another, using one (usually *opsis*) to add, confirm, cast doubt, or even refute the information another has provided, which in turn shows his audience in detail his *historie*, his investigative methods, at work.[35] Pretty much every autopsy statement in the text has this function, but rather than run through all of them, below I look in more detail at a few of the more important and interesting examples to illustrate further the overall functions of autopsy in the text.

3.3.1: **Opsis** *used to add information*

By far the most common use of *opsis* in relation to other sources is to add further information on a particular topic and thus create a more accurate account. One

[34] See for example: 1.92, 2.156, 9.85.

[35] Dewald (1987) 158 notes that *opsis* is used in particular as supporting evidence for something which may seem extraordinary or to refute a particular version of events – in other words, where a stronger form of proof is needed.

way in which Herodotus does this is by deciphering inscriptions on certain monuments: for example, he describes the tomb of Alyattes, which he considers one of the few Lydian θώματα, and then adds that in his day there were still five plaques at the top of the tomb engraved with inscriptions recording how much each of the three groups which built it (traders, artisans and prostitutes) had contributed.

On working out these figures he discovers that the prostitutes did much of the work: οὗροι δὲ πέντε ἐόντες ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἦσαν ἐπὶ τοῦ σήματος ἄνω, καί σφι γράμματα ἐνεκεκόλαπτο τὰ ἕκαστοι ἐξεργάσαντο. καὶ ἐφαίνετο μετρεόμενον τὸ τῶν παιδισκέων ἔργον ἐὸν μέγιστον ('Even in my day there were five plaques at the top of the tomb engraved with a written record of what each of these three groups had done, which prove, when the figures are added up, that the prostitutes made the greatest contribution' – 1.93.3).[36]

Similarly, when gathering information on the pyramids at Giza, he relays the content of the inscription on Cheops' pyramid which, as his interpreter informs him, gives the amounts spent on provisions for the labourers who built it : καὶ ὡς ἐμὲ εὖ μεμνῆσθαι τὰ ὁ ἑρμηνεύς μοι ἐπιλεγόμενος τὰ γράμματα ἔφη, ἐξακόσια καὶ χίλια τάλαντα ἀργυρίου τετελέσθαι ('If I remember correctly, the translator reading the inscription told me that the total cost was sixteen hundred silver talents' – 2.125.6).[37]

Herodotus is also able to add a description of the road leading up to the pyramid (2.124.4-5) and state that the pyramid was smaller than Chephren's 'because I measured them both myself' (ταῦτα γὰρ ὦν καὶ ἠμεῖς ἐμετρήσαμεν – 2.127.1).[38] Note here the emphatic γὰρ and the use of the pronoun to underline the importance of the personal guarantee being given – the reliability of this additional information is affirmed by Herodotus' autopsy.

---

[36] See Ratté (1994) on the possible identification of Lydian royal tombs including that of Alyattes.

[37] A completely inaccurate translation: see Lloyd (1988) 70. Steiner (1994) 138 suggests that the detail of amounts spent on radishes, onions and garlic for the workers robs the tomb and Cheops of their dignity and is an example of how Herodotus appears to undermine the memorialising nature of the pyramids.

[38] See Lloyd (1988) 70-1, 74 and the previous chapter for discussion of these passages.

We find Herodotus doing something similar in relation to the *stele* in the agora at Samos inscribed with the names of the men who refused to desert their positions at the battle of Lade (6.14.3) or the offerings dedicated by various Greek states after the battles of Salamis and Plataea (8.121.2; 8.122; 9.81.1). In each case, using *opsis* to examine monuments and dedications and the messages they contain in more detail is how Herodotus attempts to read the material remains of the past, add to his narrative and deepen his audience's knowledge of past events.[39]

Another way in which Herodotus uses *opsis* to enrich his narrative is in the vivid descriptions of certain cities which are clearly based on autopsy. Probably the most notable of these is his description of Babylon (1.178-200). He gives a careful account of its geography, size, defences, crops, royal palace and temples, all designed to provide an awe-inspiring impression of this great city (τῆς δὲ Ἀσσυρίης ἐστι μέν κου καὶ ἄλλα πολίσματα μεγάλα πολλά, τὸ δὲ ὀνομαστότατον καὶ ἰσχυρότατον … ἦν Βαβυλών, ἐοῦσα τοιαύτη δή τις πόλις; 'Now, among all the many important cities in Assyria, the most famous and well-fortified ... was Babylon. Here is a description of the city' – 1.178.1).

In a similar vein, he describes the temple of Bubastis at Bubastis which is so marvellous that there is no temple 'more pleasant to be seen' (ἡδονὴ δὲ ἰδέσθαι οὐδὲν τούτου μᾶλλον – 2.137.5) and he gives an evocative account of how one stands in the city looking down on the temple as the street level has been raised but the temple remains in its original position (2.138.2).

Herodotus also gives meticulous descriptions of the tombs in the sanctuaries at Sais and Delos. At Sais the sanctuary of Athena contains the tombs of Apries and Amasis, the former placed 'right next to the temple, on the left-hand side as you enter' (ἀγχοτάτω τοῦ μεγάρου, ἐσιόντι ἀριστερῆς χειρός), while the latter lies within the precinct, within a huge stone colonnade where the columns are made to

[39] See Hartmann (2013) on the use of monuments and inscriptions in ancient historiography, 36-7, 39 and 43-4 on Herodotus in particular – he groups Herodotus with Pausanias as representing the periegetic tradition which sees the value in monuments for extracting information about the past, as opposed to a more sceptical approach which starts with Thucydides; also Hornblower and Pelling (2017) 102 on the battle of Lade *stele* which 'not merely reinforces [Herodotus'] own text in giving lasting memory where it is due ... but also provides evidential support for the account he has given'; but see also Liddel and Low (2013b) 14, referencing West (1985) on Herodotus' use of inscriptions to 'adorn and accompany narratives', rather than as a catalyst for historical enquiry.

look like palm trees (2.169.4-5).[40] He also describes the tomb of the Egyptian god Osiris as well as some obelisks and a pond (2.170).

At Delos, Herodotus describes the tombs of the first Hyperborean women who came to the island; that of Hyperoche and Laodice is 'inside the sanctuary of Artemis, on the left as one enters, with an olive tree growing over it' (ἐστι ἔσω ἐς τὸ Ἀρτεμίσιον ἐσιόντι ἀριστερῆς χειρός, ἐπιπέφυκε δέ οἱ ἐλαίη – 4.34.2) while that of Opis and Arge is 'behind the grounds of the sanctuary of Artemis, facing east, right next to the banqueting hall of the Ceans' (ἐστὶ ὄπισθε τοῦ Ἀρτεμισίου, πρὸς ἠῶ τετραμμένη, ἀγχοτάτω τοῦ Κηίων ἰστιητορίου – 4.35.4).

Here Herodotus uses detailed descriptions based on his own autopsy to create vivid visual images for his audience, giving them a good feel for the geography of the places which form part of his narrative and a sense of the monuments which provide vital evidence for his investigation – they can imagine themselves standing with Herodotus in Amasis' colonnade of stone palms or by the Hyperborean tomb under the shade of an olive tree.

Herodotus also employs visual comparisons to further his audience's understanding of his narrative.[41] When describing the pond within the sanctuary of Athena at Sais, he compares it in size to that at Delos (μέγαθος, ὡς ἐμοὶ ἐδόκεε, ὅση περ ἡ ἐν Δήλῳ ἡ τροχοειδὴς καλεομένη; 'it appeared to me that the size of this pond is about the same as the so-called Round Pond at Delos' – 2.170.2).[42] Similarly, at 3.5.2 in describing the journey from Phoenicia into Egypt, Herodotus mentions the city of Cadytis 'which appeared to me not much smaller than Sardis' (ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκέει, Σαρδίων οὐ πολλῷ ἐλάσσονος). In both cases, Herodotus is using his autopsy of different places to give his audience points of reference to better understand the places mentioned. He is also appealing to their own autopsy (in case any of them have been to Delos or Sardis themselves) to aid their appreciation of places they are less likely to have seen (Sais and Cadytis).

[40] Lloyd (1988) 205 questions whether Herodotus, as a Greek, would have been allowed to see the tombs himself.

[41] This is part of Herodotus' broader use of analogy – see Corcella (1984) and (2013); Grethlein (2013) 215.

[42] Lloyd (1988) 209 and (2007) 368 agrees that the phrase ὡς ἐμοὶ ἐδόκεε here implies autopsy. See Chapter 2 for the argument that this phrase can indicate autopsy.

While describing how Cambyses in his madness made fun of the cult statue in the temple of Hephaestus at Memphis, Herodotus compares its image to the Phoenician Pataici (dwarf-like creatures which the Phoenicians placed on the prows of their ships)[43] but in case this still does not help his audience he explains that the Pataici look like dwarfs: ὃς δὲ τούτους μὴ ὅπωπε, ἔγω δὲ σημανέω: πυγμαίου ἀνδρὸς μίμησίς ἐστι ('for anyone who has not seen them, I can tell you that they resemble dwarfs' – 3.37.2).[44] He also compares the statues of the Cabeiroi to that of Hephaestus: ἔστι δὲ καὶ ταῦτα ὅμοῖα τοῖσι τοῦ Ἡφαίστου: τούτου δέ σφεας παῖδας λέγουσι εἶναι ('these statues are very similar to those of Hephaestus: for the Cabeiroi are said to be his children' – 3.37.3).[45]

Here we have quite a complex set of visual comparisons: the statue of Hephaestus looks like the Pataici, which in turn look like dwarfs, while the Cabeiroi also look like Hephaestus and therefore presumably like the Pataici and dwarfs also. Herodotus seems to be trying to give his audience the best chance of visualising the statues of Hephaestus and the Cabeiroi which form part of his narrative of Cambyses' madness (as well as showing off his antiquarian knowledge).[46]

There is similar effort on Herodotus' part when he describes the bronze bowl set up by the Scythians in Exampaeus to represent the size of their population (made out of arrowheads, one for each person). He states that the bowl is six times larger than that which Pausanias set up at the mouth of the Euxine Sea, but 'for anyone who has not seen [Pausanias'] bowl', Herodotus describes the Scythian one: ὃς δὲ μὴ εἶδέ κω τοῦτον, ὧδε δηλώσω (4.81.4). Here we find the same concern that the

[43] See Asheri (2007) 435.

[44] The Pataici are depicted on Phoenician amulets and coins of the sixth and fifth centuries BC (see Asheri (2007) 435) so Herodotus may have considered this a good visual comparison as there was a chance some of his audience had seen these objects.

[45] See Bowden (2010) 49-67 on the cult of the Cabeiroi, in particular 61-2 on their origins; the main centres of the cult appear to have been on Lemnos and in Boeotia, although very little is known about their rites.

[46] Both these passages are cited by Hollmann (2011) in his detailed study of signs in the *Histories*. For Hollmann, Herodotus is here relaying and decoding another visual sign for his audience (underlined by the use of 'sign' language – ἐγὼ δὲ σημανέω). Hollmann (26-7) also agrees that Herodotus is showing off his erudition: the two comparisons 'lend him an air of control and superior knowledge. As a panhellenic traveller, he is in a position to interpret and draw explanatory parallels between the exotic and the familiar for a parochial audience'.

audience should more fully understand what he is describing by an appeal to another object which they are more likely to have seen – but Herodotus gives a full description anyway in case this is still of no help. Note that the sentence structure here is very similar to that at 3.37.2 (ὃς δὲ τούτους μὴ ὅπωπε, ἐγὼ δὲ σημανέω); the ignorance of his audience (μὴ εἶδέ) powerfully contrasted with Herodotus' ability to enlighten them (δηλώσω / σημανέω).

Two key conclusions can be drawn from Herodotus' use of visual comparisons to enhance his narrative. First, he is not just using his own autopsy, but in fact appealing to the potential autopsy of his audience – one can almost imagine him giving readings of his work and interacting with the audience, invoking their visual knowledge of familiar objects. He thereby gives the audience a more active role in his investigation, drawing on their own experiences and demonstrating how autopsy can be used to further an enquiry. In this way the text takes on a didactic flavour, with Herodotus perhaps inspiring the next generation of investigators.[47]

Second, in each of the four passages discussed above (2.170.2, 3.5.2, 3.37.2-3 and 4.81.4), Herodotus' presence is very much felt: it is *his* autopsy (ὡς ἐμοὶ ἐδόκεε) which allows him to draw these comparisons and he uses the personal pronoun and first person verbs (ἐγὼ δὲ σημανέω, δηλώσω) to describe the objects in question. We very much get the sense that this is a narrative based on personal experience (which therefore puts him in a superior position in relation to his audience) and Herodotus wants to show that it comes with the stamp of authority that can only be given by a narrator who is also an eyewitness.

3.3.2: **Opsis** *used to confirm information*

Another key way in which Herodotus uses *opsis* as an investigative tool is to confirm that the information provided by other sources (usually *akoe*) is correct.[48] Interestingly, most instances of the motif phrases – ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμέ; (ἔτι καὶ) τὸ μέχρι ἐμεῦ; ἔτι καὶ νῦν (discussed in the previous chapter) – are used in this way; unsurprisingly, as they are statements of proof (and part of the language of proof in the text), for example when Herodotus states that this monument, dedication etc. 'still stands' or 'is still there in my day' and therefore proves that his narrative

[47] For more on the didactic nature of the text, see the discussion below.

[48] Noted by Hedrick (1993) 23 as the most common use of *opsis* in the *Histories*.

is correct. The phrase deploys physical evidence and these monuments and dedications thus act as a visual verification of the oral sources.[49]

At 2.5.1, Herodotus confirms what the priests of Hephaestus have told him about the land once being under water by using visual evidence – one can see that the land has been gained from the river and silt can still be dredged up from the sea bed a day's journey out from the land.[50] Similarly, he confirms the stories he hears in Egypt that the god Heracles originated here rather than in Greece by travelling to Tyre in Phoenicia and Thasos to see the ancient temples of Heracles in these places which predate the Greek legend (2.43-44). Herodotus also visits the battle site of Pelusium to confirm with his own autopsy the stories he has heard about the Egyptian skulls being much tougher than the Persian ones, which in turn provides evidence for his theory that the sun on their unprotected bald heads thickens Egyptian skulls (θῶμα δὲ μέγα εἶδον πυθόμενος παρὰ τῶν ἐπιχωρίων – 3.12.1).[51] These are just a few examples of the way in which Herodotus deploys autopsy to support the material his informants have given him.

In similar vein, we can also find Herodotus using the physical, visible traces of the past as evidence for events. He points to the remains of houses and the slipways for ships as signs of the first Ionians and Carians who came to Egypt in the seventh century BC as mercenaries for Psammetichus and settled on the Nile (probably the mercenary camps at Daphnae are meant) on land provided for them (ἐκ τῶν δὲ ἐξανέστησαν χώρων ἐν τούτοισι δὴ οἵ τε ὀλκοὶ τῶν νεῶν καὶ τὰ ἐρείπια τῶν οἰκημάτων τὸ μέχρι ἐμεῦ ἦσαν – 2.154.5),[52] and the slipways left by Necho's trireme building in the Arabian Gulf by the Red Sea as evidence of his military campaigns in the region (ἔτι οἱ ὀλκοί εἰσι δῆλοι – 2.159.1). The ruined remains of eight forts built by Darius on the banks of the River Oarus in Scythia are indicative

[49] This reflects the development of rational argument in the fifth century BC and the need to deploy proof to convince an audience (as seen in the work of the natural philosophers and Hippocratic writers): see Thomas (2000) 168-212 and Chapter 6 below.

[50] Lloyd (1976) 38 notes the strong emphasis on *opsis* here together with a decidedly polemical tone, no doubt because Herodotus is also responding to other contemporary theories on Egyptian geography, in particular those of Hecataeus.

[51] Arrington (2015) 25-6 supports Herodotus' autopsy here, linking it to a wider Greek interest in battlefield sightseeing.

[52] See Lloyd (1988) 137-9.

of his Scythian expedition (ἔτι ἐς ἐμὲ τὰ ἐρείπια σόα ἦν – 4.124.1). These examples are like a very early form of archaeology, as Herodotus tries to use the unintentional traces left by people in the past to back up the stories he has been told about their lives.

But by far the most common use of *opsis* as a stamp of confirmation is in relation to the *intentional* traces of the past, i.e., dedications and monuments left by individuals or city-states in commemoration of particular events which provide the ideal visual evidence for Herodotus to support his historical narrative.[53] We find Herodotus pointing to the chains used to bind prisoners, the Spartans by the Tegeans and the Boeotians and Chalcidians by the Athenians, later dedicated in the temple of Athena Alea in Tegea and on the Acropolis in Athens respectively, as evidence of the outcome of both conflicts (ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἦσαν σόαι – 1.66.4; αἵ περ ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἦσαν περιεοῦσαι – 5.77.3).[54] The Athenians also built a bronze four-horse chariot as a dedicatory offering which Herodotus describes as being positioned on the left hand side as one enters the Propylaia (τὸ δὲ ἀριστερῆς χειρὸς ἔστηκε πρῶτον ἐσιόντι – 5.77.4); he quotes the dedicatory inscription.[55]

The numerous dedications made by Croesus in Greece – the gold and silver bowls, gold shield and lion, and four silver jars at Delphi (1.50.3, 1.51.2-4); the gold shield, spear and tripod at Thebes (1.52); the golden cows and pillars at Ephesus (1.92)[56] – are all evidence for Herodotus of this king's special relationship with Greece, and

[53] For this idea of intentional history, the creation of a historical narrative for future generations, see Foxhall and Luraghi (2010) and Gehrke (2010); Grethlein (2013) explores how characters in the narrative use physical monuments to 'write' the history of their achievements.

[54] Hornblower (2013) 223 notes that Herodotus avoids a direct statement of autopsy in relation to the chains at 5.77.3, 'but the assumption of autopsy is a reasonable one, given the amount of detail he provides'.

[55] See Liddel and Low (2013b) 7-8 on Herodotus' use of this monument and inscription and Boedeker (1998) 199-200 on how its interpretation may have changed over time. Fragments of the inscription were found on the Acropolis in 1869 and an earlier version of it was found north-east of the Propylaia in 1887; it has been restored on the basis of Herodotus 5.77.4 (see ML 28-9). Liddel and Low note the 'close compatibility' of Herodotus' transcription with the surviving fragments, which supports his autopsy of the monument. See also Hornblower (2013) 224 comparing Herodotus' description with the inscriptions and also Pausanias' account (*Periegesis*, I.28.2).

[56] The dedications at Thebes were originally made to the hero Amphiaraos at his sanctuary in the Oropeia, on the border between Attica and Boeotia; for more on this healing sanctuary see Petsalis-Diomedis (2006). Fragments of dedicatory inscriptions for Croesus' gifts to the Temple of Artemis at Ephesus have been found – see Fornara 31.

his frequent use of its oracles, especially that of Apollo at Delphi.[57] Similarly, the memorials to the dead set up at Thermopylae, in particular the lion commemorating Leonidas, provide the present visual proof of the heroic but ill-fated battle fought there by the Spartans in the face of the Persian invasion (7.225.2; 7.28).

The *stelai* (pillars) set up by Sesostris to record his conquests of different peoples are another good example of how Herodotus uses monuments to support the evidence of *akoe*. The Egyptian priests tell Herodotus that when the people Sesostris fought turned out to be cowardly and surrendered to him too easily, he added an image of female genitalia to these pillars to indicate their feebleness.[58]

At first it seems as though Herodotus will have trouble discovering whether or not this is true as most of these pillars do not survive to his day (αἱ μὲν πλεῦνες οὐκέτι φαίνονται περιεοῦσαι…) but Herodotus then finds them in Palestinian Syria with the inscriptions and images of female genitalia which have been described to him, thereby confirming the story of the priests (…ἐν δὲ τῇ Παλαιστίνῃ Συρίῃ αὐτὸς ὥρων ἐούσας καὶ τὰ γράμματα τὰ εἰρημένα ἐνεόντα καὶ γυναικὸς αἰδοῖα – 2.106.1). Once again the contrasting particle δὲ and the emphasis on his own autopsy (αὐτὸς ὥρων) provide that crucial authorial guarantee, underlining the confirmatory role in relation to other sources which *opsis* plays in the text.[59]

---

[57] Famously Croesus tests each of the oracles in Greece to discover which are accurate (1.46-9) – see Flower (2008) 147-52 on this episode. As well as the temple of Apollo at Delphi, Croesus is also satisfied with the answer from Amphiaraos (1.49) and dedicates to him the gold shield and spear which Herodotus sees in the temple of Ismenian Apollo at Thebes (1.52). See Papazarkadas (2014b) 233-47 discussing the inscription of a dedicatory epigram, in Boeotian and Ionic script, on a stone column drum found in March 2005 in the south-eastern part of modern Thebes: though much eroded, the epigram as reconstructed links Apollo and Amphiaraos (thus supporting Herodotus' assertion of a connection between the two at Thebes) and Papazarkadas suggests that it may in fact be the inscription that Herodotus saw in the temple, or one which was derived from it – it appears that the shield was at some point stolen from the sanctuary of Amphiaraos and subsequently recovered by the shrine supervisor with the assistance of Ismenian Apollo's oracle, thus explaining its later presence in Apollo's shrine. Cf. Thonemann (2016) suggesting that the 'Croesus' referred to as the dedicator in this inscription was in fact a sixth-century BC Athenian aristocrat rather than the Lydian king, though he strongly supports Herodotus' autopsy of the sanctuary and its dedications.

[58] See Steiner (1994) 128-9 on these *stelai* in the context of Oriental monarchs using inscribed memorials to assert and perpetuate their power.

[59] As Lloyd points out, this is part of Herodotus' broader strategy of supporting a tradition with "archaeological" proof. However, he is not immune from the dangers of arguing from lack of

3.3.3: **Opsis** *used to refute or cast doubt on other information*

Examples of autopsy used to refute or cast doubt on information from other sources are far less numerous, but all the more striking as they reveal the true weight of *opsis* as compared to other sources and the strength of the authorial guarantee.[60] The most powerful instance of this use is 2.130-1, where, during a visit to the royal palace at Sais, Herodotus comes across twenty wooden statues of women whose hands are broken off. He warns his audience that the only evidence for the identity of these women comes from *akoe*: αἵτινες μέντοι εἰσί, οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν πλὴν ἢ τὰ λεγόμενα ('but as to who these women are, I can only relay what I was told' – 2.130.2).

It appears that there are two different stories concerning their identity: one (told by the priests) states that they were the concubines of the Egyptian king Mycerinus; the other that they were serving-maids to the king's daughter. This second story narrates how Mycerinus raped his own daughter who then killed herself, and the king's wife cut off the hands of the twenty serving-maids who had betrayed her daughter to the king (the story thus accounting for the statues' missing hands).[61] But Herodotus refutes this second account:

---

evidence. Although Herodotus admits here that many of Sesostris' *stelai* do not survive, he argues at 2.103 that Sesostris' army did not advance into Europe further than Scythia and Thrace because the *stelai* 'can be seen there, but nowhere further on' (ἐν μὲν γὰρ τῇ τούτων χώρῃ φαίνονται σταθεῖσαι αἱ στῆλαι, τὸ δὲ προσωτέρω τούτων οὐκέτι – 2.103.1). He does not consider the possibility that those *stelai* might not have survived. For more on Herodotus' analysis of these *stelai*, see Lloyd (1988) 20-1 and West (1992) esp. 118. Indeed, more generally Herodotus sometimes lays himself open to criticism by (apparently) too readily accepting monuments and dedications as proof of past events without more closely considering their potentially propagandist nature (although cf. his interpretation of the tombs at Plataea at 9.85) – for more on this see Chapter 4.

[60] As Lightfoot (2003) 164-5 points out in her analysis of the debt owed by Lucian's *On the Syrian Goddess* to Herodotus, the main purpose of authorial statements of autopsy is to invite confidence in the narrator. She also notes that statements of *akoe* are always positive, a fact which perhaps by contrast highlights the more sophisticated nature of *opsis* as a source.

[61] The statues are in fact most likely to have represented attendants of Isis and/or Osiris. Sais was a major centre for the worship of Osiris and the wooden cow (to be found in a nearby room in the palace – 2.130.1) played a key role. The cow's hollow, gold-covered form apparently represented the goddess Isis and contained the headless mummy of her husband Osiris: Lloyd (2007) 334-5. Herodotus appears to recognise this connection when he explains that the cow was carried outside once a year 'when the Egyptians mourn the death of the god whom I will not name in this context' (2.132.2). Herodotus often shows reticence in mentioning Osiris by name.

> ταῦτα δὲ λέγουσι φλυηρέοντες, ὡς ἐγὼ δοκέω, τά τε ἄλλα καὶ δὴ καὶ τὰ περὶ τὰς χεῖρας τῶν κολοσσῶν: ταῦτα γὰρ ὦν καὶ ἡμεῖς ὡρῶμεν ὅτι ὑπὸ χρόνου τὰς χεῖρας ἀποβεβλήκασι, αἳ ἐν ποσὶ αὐτέων ἐφαίνοντο ἐοῦσαι ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμέ.
>
> But what they say is all nonsense, in my opinion, and in particular the part about the statues' hands. For I myself saw the statues, and it was clear that the passage of time was responsible for the loss of their hands, because right up to my day they could still be seen lying on the ground at the statues' feet (2.131.3).[62]

Herodotus here uses his own autopsy, which reveals to him that the statues' hands had been broken off over time, to refute the story that they had been deliberately cut off.[63] The profusion of autopsy language in such a short passage (ἡμεῖς ὡρῶμεν … ἐφαίνοντο … ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμέ) is extraordinary, as is the emphatic repetition of the authorial guarantee (the personal pronoun twice – ἐγὼ … ἡμεῖς – and the emphatic γὰρ).

Also instructive is the fact that *opsis* of the statues is not just used to refute the part of the story about their hands, but the entire narrative about Mycerinus' rape of his daughter, as is revealed when Herodotus says that the story is nonsense, *especially* (καὶ δὴ καὶ) the part about the statues' hands. Therefore we can see that disproving part of the story by using *opsis* is enough for Herodotus to disbelieve the whole of it – such is the power of *opsis* as a source. This is the most potent example in the text of the ability of *opsis* to provide a check on other sources, but also shows Herodotus putting his neck on the line: the conclusion is his deduction (ὡς ἐγὼ δοκέω – note also the use of *gnome*) and reveals to his audience his authoritative, investigative persona, comparing conflicting accounts and judging them based on the evidence of his own eyes.

---

[62] Luraghi (2006) 78 notes that this is an example of iconatrophy, a feature of oral tradition 'whereby a monument becomes the focus of stories that explain its features, with a rather loose connection to the real circumstances of its construction'.

[63] As is accepted by Corcella (2013) 47 even though he otherwise views *opsis* as having a secondary role to Herodotus' other sources in the text.

Indeed, so compelling is the evidence from *opsis* in this case that Herodotus is even prepared to break his own principle of not commenting on the reliability of one story over another, but merely reporting all versions of an event and leaving his audience to make up their own minds.[64] The restatement of this rule just beforehand – οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν πλὴν ἢ τὰ λεγόμενα ('I can say nothing [about the statues' identity] except what I was told' – 2.130.2) – creates a paradox which only serves to increase the effectiveness of autopsy in disproving this version of the story and demonstrating to his audience just how much weight he is prepared to give to *opsis* as a source as he breaks his own rule to do so.

A couple of chapters further on (2.134) Herodotus describes Mycerinus' pyramid, the smallest of the three at Giza, the building of which some Greeks have attributed to the Thracian courtesan Rhodopis. Herodotus firmly rejects this tradition (οὐκ ὀρθῶς λέγοντες: οὐδὲ ὦν οὐδὲ εἰδότες μοι φαίνονται λέγειν – 'they do not speak the truth. Indeed those who say this seem to me to know absolutely nothing about her…' – 2.134.1-2): Rhodopis could hardly have built a pyramid 'such as this' (τοιαύτην) as it must have cost many thousands of talents to build, and in any case she was alive far later than the date of the pyramids, arriving in Egypt during the reign of Amasis.[65]

This first argument against the Rhodopis tradition is clearly based on autopsy. A pyramid 'such as this' must have been very expensive to build, a conclusion reached by looking at the pyramid – its size and construction of Ethiopian stone, i.e., Aswan granite, are beyond the resources of a mere courtesan, however successful.[66] This is another example of Herodotus using *opsis* to argue against a version of events, the refutation strengthened by the use of the double negative (οὐκ … οὐδὲ ὦν οὐδὲ).

A similar approach can be found early in Book 4, where Herodotus uses *opsis* as part of an argument in favour of one version of the account of the Scythians'

[64] See 2.123.1 and 7.152.3 for the programmatic statements of this rule which apply to the whole text.

[65] His argument appears to have had little effect given that later authors repeat the Rhodopis tradition: Diodorus I 64.14; Strabo XVII 1.33; Pliny, *NH* XXXVI 82. See Lloyd (1988) 84-5 and (2007) 337.

[66] For autopsy of the other two pyramids at Giza, see 2.124-7.

origins. He narrates the Scythian version (the legend of the three sons) and the local Greek version (based on a visit by Heracles) before giving the third (and his preferred – ἄλλος λόγος … τῷ μάλιστα λεγομένῳ αὐτός πρόσκειμαι – 4.11.1) version – that the Scythians were originally a nomadic tribe living in Asia but were driven west by the Massagetae into an area occupied by the Cimmerians who were themselves driven further west by the arrival of the Scythians. Herodotus points to the grave of the Cimmerian royal family (who killed each other rather than leave their homeland) which can 'still be seen' (ἔτι δῆλός ἐστι – 4.11.4) by the River Tyras, and the many places in Scythia in his own day which are called 'Cimmerian' (καὶ νῦν ἔστι… – 4.12.1-2). Yet again, Herodotus uses *opsis* to select one version of events and cast doubt on the reliability of the other two.

These instances of Herodotus using *opsis* to refute evidence gathered through *akoe* or choose between different traditions or versions of events demonstrate its role in the text as a control on other sources, suggesting a prominent role in Herodotus' investigative method, as will be further discussed below.

3.3.4: Denial of autopsy

In contrast to the dominant investigative role of autopsy discussed above, there are five occasions in the text where Herodotus explicitly denies having seen something. At 2.73.1 he is careful to explain that he has not seen a live phoenix, but only a painting of one (ἐγὼ μέν μιν οὐκ εἶδον εἰ μὴ ὅσον γραφῇ) and he casts doubt even on this as a source with the use of the conditional ('*if* the painting is a true likeness...' – εἰ τῇ γραφῇ παρόμοιος – 2.73.2). Most of his evidence for the phoenix comes from what he is told in Heliopolis about it and at least part of this story (that the bird arrives from Arabia carrying its father in an egg made of myrrh) he does not believe (ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐ πιστὰ λέγοντες – 2.73.3).

Herodotus does not go as far as openly to voice doubt over the bird's existence, but the language used (the clear distinction made between sources and the scepticism about the accuracy of the painting)[67] creates an air of uncertainty and prompts his audience to wonder how much reliable information is available, a position

[67] Lloyd (1988) 317: 'note how careful Herodotus is to define his source'; Lloyd (2007) 288: 'note Herodotus' care in defining the basis of his description'.

underlined by the strong denial of autopsy (ἐγὼ … οὐκ εἶδον).[68] There is also the interesting implication that autopsy of a representation of a thing (here the painting of the phoenix) is one stage removed in terms of reliability from autopsy of the thing itself, similar to another person's eyewitness account.

Similarly, when examining Lake Moeris (assumed to be artificial because of the two pyramids in the middle) Herodotus explains that he could not see where the earth excavated from the lake had gone (οὐκ ὥρων τὸν χοῦν οὐδαμοῦ ἐόντα) and this inability to use autopsy troubles him (ἐπιμελὲς γὰρ δή μοι ἦν – 2.150.2).[69] Again the emphatic denial of autopsy is underlined by the double negative (οὐκ … οὐδαμοῦ), but he is eventually satisfied by the explanation that the earth was dumped in the River Nile, accepting this account because he has heard of a similar practice in the Assyrian city of Ninus where earth from a tunnel being excavated was dumped in the River Tigris. It is interesting to note, however, that Herodotus here finds the evidence from *akoe* 'persuasive' (εὐπετέως ἔπειθον) because it is supported by another oral report – this suggests he requires more than one piece of evidence from *akoe* in order for it to have the same weight as that from *opsis* which is missing in this instance.

Herodotus is told by Egyptians that the island of Chemmis in the sanctuary of Leto at Buto is in fact a floating island, but he does not see this phenomenon for himself, so casts doubt on the story: 'I myself never saw it floating or moving, and I wondered, when I was told it was a floating island, whether it really was' (αὐτὸς μὲν ἔγωγε οὔτε πλέουσαν οὔτε κινηθεῖσαν εἶδον, τέθηπα δὲ ἀκούων εἰ νῆσος ἀληθέως ἐστὶ πλωτή – 2.156.2).[70] Again we have the emphatic denial of autopsy, this time underlined by the pronoun and reflexive as well as the double negative (lit: *neither* floating *nor* moving).

---

[68] Marincola (1987) 126 agrees that the denial of autopsy here is deployed to warn the reader that the information being relayed cannot be vouched for and is only as good as the source.

[69] Lloyd (1988) 128: 'note the extreme care with which Herodotus checks his information both by *opsis* and oral enquiry'; Lloyd (2007) 352: 'Herodotus shows meticulous care in checking his sources'.

[70] Lloyd (1988) 144 points out that the Egyptians may have been thinking of the island in a mythical context in terms of its alleged ability to float.

The μὲν ... δὲ phrase also draws attention to the contrast between the two sources: autopsy (εἶδον) shows him that the island does not float; *akoe* (ἀκούων) tells him that it does, and immediately the disparity between the two and lack of confirming autopsy to back up the oral source causes him to cast doubt on the veracity of the story (εἰ νῆσος ἀληθέως ἐστὶ πλωτή). In contrast to the episode at 2.150.2 discussed above, this single oral report together with his lack of autopsy is insufficient to convince Herodotus that the island really might float – there is just not enough evidence to be certain.[71]

During his visit to Babylon Herodotus is also clear that he did not see a particular gold statue, twelve cubits in height, as it was stolen by the Persian king Xerxes. Therefore he only has oral evidence as to its existence: 'I did not see it myself, but I am repeating what the Chaldeans say' (ἐγὼ μέν μιν οὐκ εἶδον, τὰ δὲ λέγεται ὑπὸ Χαλδαίων, ταῦτα λέγω – 1.183.3). This time we are given no indication of what Herodotus thinks of the reliability of this evidence, he merely repeats it. But we do have the familiar emphatic denial of autopsy (ἐγὼ ... οὐκ εἶδον) coupled with the μεν ... δε contrast phrase to oppose the evidence from *opsis* and *akoe* (μέν ... εἶδον ... δὲ λέγεται).

The only other explicit denial of autopsy comes at 3.6.1 where Herodotus claims that although Egypt imports wine from Greece and Phoenicia, it is not possible to see a single empty wine jar in Egypt (καὶ ἓν κεράμιον οἰνηρὸν ἀριθμῷ κεινὸν οὐκ ἔστι ὡς λόγῳ εἰπεῖν ἰδέσθαι).[72] The reason for this, he explains, is that they are sent to Memphis where they are filled with water and sent on to the waterless

[71] Both the phoenix and the floating island stories had been recorded by Hecataeus (*FrGrHist* 1 F 324 and 305) so there is likely to be an element of polemic here, an interaction with contemporary debate on these topics, and perhaps an attempt to challenge the status quo. This would also help to explain the strength of the denial. See Lloyd (1975) 131.

[72] It could be argued that the lack of Sesostris' *stelai* beyond Scythia and Thrace, noted at 2.103.1, is a further example (see n.60 for discussion). Smith (1987) 62 thinks this episode shows Herodotus is aware of the dangers of arguing from negative evidence (perhaps because he uses the language of opinion – μοι δοκέει – to reach his conclusion?). But more convincing is that here Herodotus is too easily swayed by his lack of autopsy, convinced that the absence of visible monuments proves Sesostris did not venture beyond Thrace when he himself admits a few chapters later that most of these monuments do not survive (2.106.1). Lloyd (1988) 21 argues that Herodotus' belief that the *stelai* were set up in Scythia and Thrace is most likely based on *gnome*: Sesostris had conquered the Thracians and Scythians and was in the habit of setting up *stelai* to commemorate his victories, therefore such *stelai* would have been set up in Thrace and Scythia.

regions of Syria. He gives no indication of the origins of this story or why he is prepared to believe it (given he thinks it clarifies the issue – ἐγὼ καὶ τοῦτο φράσω – 3.6.2). Clearly the claim that there are *no* wine jars in Egypt is an exaggeration so perhaps he realises that in order to convince his audience he needs to present the explanation in a strong light.[73] Perhaps it is merely another example of Herodotus' love of unusual and bizarre stories.[74] It is, however, interesting to note that in this instance Herodotus uses the passive rather than active voice (there are no wine jars 'to be seen' (ἰδέσθαι) rather than 'I did not see any wine jars') as though he were distancing himself from the anecdote, perhaps aware of the incredulous response it may provoke.[75]

Why does Herodotus choose to deny autopsy so explicitly in these instances, and what are the consequences for the overall picture of *opsis* in the text? These passages provide further evidence of Herodotus' characteristic precision in distinguishing between sources, his keenness to show his audience whence a particular piece of information comes. To some extent they also reveal him distancing himself from 'unbelievable' material – the phoenix, the floating island – or narratives that cannot be confirmed or refuted by that ultimate proof, autopsy. As Marincola puts it, the denial of autopsy 'limits the credulity of the historian' and puts him above the average story-teller.[76] But above all they add to the picture of *opsis* as providing the strongest and most reliable form of evidence. Without *opsis*, Herodotus hesitates to confirm a particular story (the phoenix and floating island), refuses to pass judgment (the gold statue in Babylon), or requires more than one confirmatory story (i.e., evidence from *akoe*) before he is convinced (the earth from Lake Moeris).[77]

---

[73] See Asheri (2007) 405.

[74] Alternatively, Herodotus might be testing his audience to see whether they believe his explanation now he has demonstrated the difficulties in establishing the truth where there is a total lack of autopsy.

[75] For more on the active versus the passive voice in autopsy references, see section 3.4 below.

[76] Marincola (1987) 126.

[77] Wood (2016) 22 n.45 also suggests that by emphasising what he did not see, Herodotus may imply that he did see other features in the places he describes, i.e., he 'enhance[s] the credibility of his account by defining the limits of his efforts'.

In each of these passages the explicit denial of autopsy is contrasted with the information he has been able to discover from oral sources. This reminds us of those other passages in the text where Herodotus carefully indicates what information comes from which source: the upper (*opsis*) and lower (*akoe*) rooms of the Egyptian labyrinth (2.148); the offerings made by Croesus at temples in Thebes, Ephesus and Delphi (*opsis*) and those at Miletus (*akoe*) (1.92); collecting pitch from a pool in Zacynthos (*opsis*) and Cyrauis (*akoe*) (4.195). But the effect of these explicit denials is to make us even more aware of the limitations of *akoe* in these other places where *opsis* can only provide partial evidence – having noted Herodotus' doubts where *opsis* is not present, we are now bound to have less faith in Herodotus' descriptions of the underground labyrinth rooms or Croesus' offerings at Miletus because they lack the support of his most trustworthy source.

On several occasions Herodotus shows us how *akoe* alone as a source (especially where the account is not first-hand) places limitations on his knowledge; this is particularly evident in his exploration of the outer reaches of the known world. As regards the Western margins of Europe, he has no reliable information to pass on (περὶ δὲ τῶν ἐν τῇ Εὐρώπῃ τῶν πρὸς ἑσπέρην ἑσχατιέων ἐγὼ μὲν οὐκ ἔχω ἀτρεκέως λέγειν – 3.115.1), rejecting stories about the existence of the river Eridanus and the Cassiterides and explaining that 'I have been unable to find anyone who has personally seen a sea on the other side of Europe and can tell me about it' (τοῦτο δὲ οὐδενὸς αὐτόπτεω γενομένου δύναμαι ἀκοῦσαι, τοῦτο μελετῶν, ὅκως θάλασσα ἐστι τὰ ἐπέκεινα τῆς Εὐρώπης – 3.115.2).[78] The region north of Scythia is also a mystery; apparently the air is thick with feathers which Herodotus interprets as snow (4.7, 4.31).

He also casts doubt on his own account of inland Scythia stating 'but no one knows clearly what lies beyond, for I cannot get information from anyone who claims to have seen it for themselves' (οὐδεὶς οἶδε ἀτρεκέως ὅ τι τὸ κατύπερθέ ἐστι: οὐδενὸς γὰρ δὴ αὐτόπτεω εἰδέναι φαμένου δύναμαι πυθέσθαι – 4.16.1). The link between lack of *opsis* (or an account based on *opsis*) and lack of knowledge is made explicitly here (note the explanatory γὰρ). Even the great traveller Aristeas did not

[78] As Asheri (2007) 504 puts it: 'when there is no autopsy, Herodotus is incredulous; ἀκοὴ is not enough'.

explore beyond the land of the Issedones, hence his information about those further regions came from the Issedones themselves – 'in other words', says Herodotus significantly, 'it was based on hearsay' (ἀλλὰ τὰ κατύπερθε ἔλεγε ἀκοῇ – 4.16.2).[79] The land to the north of Thrace is also difficult to learn about, with Herodotus only able to garner dubious tales about the land being infested with bees (5.9-10). Thus we are left in no doubt that information unsupported by autopsy, or at least a first-hand account based on autopsy, is often highly suspect and may not even be worth recording.

Is there a danger that Herodotus is undermining *akoe* which throughout the text is the source from which most of his information comes – why then should his audience believe his narrative? I would argue that Herodotus is not attempting to discredit *akoe* as a source – indeed, the picture of *opsis* versus *akoe* in the text is not entirely black and white, as is discussed below. His aim here is merely to demonstrate to his audience the potential limitations of *akoe* as a source when compared with *opsis* and caution them against believing anything they hear without having some form of corroboratory evidence. He is teaching them how to be good investigators, successful practitioners of *historie*.

From the discussion so far we have seen that *opsis* is emerging as a check on the other sources (usually *akoe*) by adding to, confirming, refuting or questioning the information they provide. It would therefore be easy to conclude that *opsis* sits securely at the top of the hierarchy of epistemological factors in Herodotus' investigative method. Indeed, most scholars would agree that this is the case: according to Luraghi, it is the 'ultimate proof of truth', used to prove or disprove a story learnt from *akoe*.[80]

Marincola agrees that explicit statements of autopsy provide a 'guarantee of the author's validation of the historical record', the most certain path to knowledge for Herodotus, strengthening or weakening belief in an oral report.[81] Corcella notes

[79] Corcella (2013) 45 highlights this passage at 4.16 as a typical example of how different sources are afforded different levels of credibility in Herodotus' enquiry.

[80] Luraghi (2006) 78.

[81] Marincola (1987) 30 (in relation to Book 2); 130 (in relation to the rest of the text). See also (1997) 67.

that Herodotus privileges 'what is seen' above any other source in his *historie*.[82] Hartog and Lateiner acknowledge that *akoe* is a less reliable and trustworthy source even though it must take over from *opsis* where it is not possible to obtain further information except via oral reports.[83] Yet other scholars concur that *opsis* acts as the deciding factor, confirming or denying that something is true.[84]

However, it is possible to find a few passages in the text which suggest a different view. The clearest example of this is at 9.85 where Herodotus is describing the tombs of the Greeks who fell at the battle of Plataea. He tells us that those of the Spartans, Tegeans, Athenians, Megarians, and Phleiasans do indeed contain bodies, but he has discovered through oral sources that all the other national tombs which can be seen at Plataea are in fact empty mounds constructed by those nations who were ashamed not to have taken part in the battle but wanted nonetheless to impress future generations by implying that they had been there.[85] The evidence from *opsis* (φαίνονται) suggests that these nations did take part in the battle, but Herodotus is able to refute this using *akoe* (ὡς ἐγὼ πυνθάνομαι) – indeed he was told (ἐγὼ ἀκούω) that the Aeginetan tomb was built as much as ten years after the battle. The repetition of the personal pronoun shows Herodotus' characteristic pride that he is personally responsible for refuting a received tradition.

We can draw two important conclusions from this passage. First, Herodotus is not entirely consistent throughout the text in portraying *opsis* as the most trustworthy source in his investigation – here, the conclusion suggested by the physical, visual evidence is disproved by an anonymous oral source. Second, this is an example of people attempting to manipulate the memorialising function of visual monuments to create a false narrative about the past. It hints at the dangers of always accepting visual evidence at face value, but also (paradoxically) points to the strength of the belief in such evidence – clearly the builders of these cenotaphs believed that they would be sufficient to induce viewers to accept a false version of historical events (although they do not deceive the skilled investigator).

---

[82] Corcella (2013) 44.

[83] Hartog (1988) 269; Lateiner (1989) 124.

[84] See, for example, Dewald (2002) 278; Raaflaub (2002) 159.

[85] See Lateiner (1990a) 233-4 for further discussion of this deception.

Asheri, however, proposes a different explanation for these monuments, namely that the empty tombs were erected to honour those fallen at Plataea who were buried elsewhere, probably in their own cities. This use of 'cenotaphs' was well-known from antiquity onwards;[86] therefore Herodotus' interpretation may in fact be mischievous ('maliziosa').[87] Certainly Herodotus may have been influenced by traditions about Plataea which wanted to attribute the participation and responsibility for success in the battle to certain groups over others. In this context, it is easy to see how he may have overlooked the impact his interpretation of the empty tombs would have on his portrayal of *opsis* as the most reliable source. However, the point about the power of visual monuments to influence interpretation of events still stands and the full extent to which characters in the narrative of the *Histories* manipulate *opsis* for their own ends will be further explored in the next chapter.

There are a few other passages in the text where visual phenomena are explained by reference to information provided by an oral source, such as the tough Egyptian and brittle Persian skulls at the Pelusium battle site which are attributed by the local inhabitants to the head gear (or lack of it) which they wore (3.12), or the sanctuary of Perseus at Chemmis whose presence is explained by a local story about the cult (2.91). It could be argued that this is merely a matter of presentation, i.e., Herodotus chooses to tell us about the visible phenomenon first followed by information from *akoe* but that together they form a complete narrative, one source complementing and confirming the evidence provided by the other.

The story about the wooden cow and female statues in the palace at Sais (discussed at section 3.3.3 above) also speaks to this interlocking aspect of the relationship between *opsis* and *akoe*. At the beginning of this passage, Herodotus

---

[86] See Arrington (2015) for discussion of cenotaphs in the context of war – the dead might be buried on the battlefield (given the impracticalities of bringing the bodies or even ashes home) and memorials in the form of cenotaphs erected in their home cities as a way of commemorating them; the Marathon monument in the public cemetery at Athens is a famous example (see 43-8). See also Low (2012) 28 n.43 on the Marathon monument.

[87] Asheri (2006) 293. There may also be an element of polemic against the Aeginetans: Asheri (1978) 196 suggests Herodotus may be implying that they are also part of the 'other Greeks' who did not participate in the battle but set up empty tombs.

describes these objects and the way they are treated by the priests (evidence from *opsis*) (2.130). He then relays what he was told about them in order to establish their identities, history and purpose (evidence from *akoe*) (2.131.1-2). But this information is then partly refuted using *opsis* when Herodotus reports that the statues' hands were broken off over time and had not been cut off (2.131.3).

At 2.106, Herodotus describes two images of Sesostris carved into the rock, one on the road between Ephesus and Phocaea, the other on the road between Sardis and Smyrna. He tells us that some people who have seen (τῶν θεησαμένων) these figures believe them to portray Memnon, 'but they are far from the truth on this matter' (πολλὸν τῆς ἀληθείης ἀπολελειμμένοι).[88] Here Herodotus uses his *opsis* to refute not a story from *akoe*, but other people's *opsis*. It is the first indication that the quality of evidence gathered from *opsis* may depend on who is doing the looking, and thus suggests that *opsis* on its own is insufficient to reach the truth – something else is also needed. I will return to discuss what that might be in the next chapter, which examines the complex picture of *opsis* drawn in the narrative of the text. The relationship between *opsis* and *akoe* may sometimes be more nuanced than it at first appears. However, in the vast majority of cases where the two are compared, *opsis* is still shown to be the more trustworthy source.

3.4: The Language of Autopsy

So far we have examined the relationship between *opsis* and the other sources (in particular *akoe*) in Herodotus' investigative method with the conclusion that *opsis* plays a dominant role in bringing the investigator closest to the 'truth'. But how does Herodotus articulate his autopsy? Is there any significance in his choice of vocabulary, tenses, the active or passive voice, and his use of the motif phrases?

In the forty-seven instances of direct eyewitness in the text, the range of vocabulary is quite varied, but by far the most frequent word is ὁράω, the main verb for 'see' (used twenty-one times, and a further three times as a compound

[88] Scholars have had much difficulty identifying these reliefs; see Lloyd (1988) 26-8 for discussion of this passage and the Greek association of the images with Memnon.

verb).[89] It is also used in all five instances of denial of direct eyewitness. The second most common word is φαίνομαι (used twelve times, once as a compound) in the sense that something is shown or 'appears' to Herodotus. Other verbs of seeing are used rarely (θεάομαι twice, θωμάζω once) or not at all (θεωρέω). He refers to his own sight (*opsis*) five times, and there is occasional use of relevant adjectives such as αὐτόπτης, φανέρος, and δῆλος. ἐμοὶ ἐδόκεε occurs five times in the sense of a physical phenomenon appearing to him in a certain way.

By contrast, the verbs θεάομαι and θεωρέω which mean 'see' in the sense of 'gazing' or 'marvelling at' (and thus imply a sense of wonder in the viewer) occur in the narrative forty-seven and four times respectively. Is Herodotus perhaps avoiding such words when referring to his own autopsy, preferring vocabulary which means 'seeing' in a more clinical or scientific sense, more befitting to a *histor*? Among Herodotus' preferred language for his own *opsis*, ἐμοὶ ἐδόκεε is a term more commonly associated with rational thought process ('it seems to me [that x is the case]') and ὀράω means 'see' in a more basic sense without the connotations of wonder.

Branscome suggests that Herodotus deliberately distances himself from this kind of gazing with 'wide-eyed wonder' in which characters in the narrative (such as Croesus, Cambyses and Xerxes) indulge; words such as θεάομαι are used for foreign kings who love to marvel at their own wealth and good fortune and thus the use of this vocabulary affirms a king's royal pride and magnificence.[90] While it is important to note that θεάομαι is also used for characters such as Solon (see 1.30.2) who clearly do not fall into this category, the absence of such language in the metanarrative can hardly be a coincidence – and is all the more striking when we consider that wonders and marvels, both natural and manmade, are a key component of Herodotus' enquiry (as noted in the proem).

Konstan has also argued that Herodotus portrays non-Greeks as looking at the world with an eye to its material wealth (one might think of Croesus or Xerxes), whereas Greeks are more interested in ἀρετή, which in this context perhaps can be

[89] The vocabulary used includes φαίνομαι (and compounds), θεάομαι, θωμάζω, ἐμοὶ ἐδόκεε, αὐτόπτης, ὄψις (ἐμὴ), φανέρος, δηλος, δείκνυμι (see Appendix A).

[90] Branscome (2013) 213-15.

characterised as self-improvement from knowledge gained about the world through empirical research.[91] The discussion of *opsis* in the narrative in the next two chapters will further illuminate this distinction, and also the contrast between Herodotus' relationship with *opsis* and that of his characters.[92]

As has been noted by scholars, explicit statements of eyewitness (category 1 in the database) account for only a small proportion of statements of autopsy in the text.[93] One of Herodotus' favoured ways of referring to his own autopsy is by use of the motif phrases ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ, (ἔτι καὶ) τὸ μέχρι ἐμεῦ, and ἔτι καὶ νῦν. Fowler has described these phrases as Herodotus' 'voiceprint' and points out that they are found nowhere else in the surviving work of other earlier or contemporary writers (apart from ἔτι καὶ νῦν which appears in a fragment of Xanthus).[94] Obviously we have to be careful when arguing *ex silentio*, but it would appear at the very least that Herodotus was promoting the use of such phrases as part of a new language of autopsy.

As discussed in the previous chapter, these motif phrases play a key role in the text in linking past with present: by recording the present reality of objects from the past they testify to the occurrence of past events and the importance for future generations of remembering their heritage. More difficult to establish is Herodotus' rationale in choosing a motif phrase rather than an explicit statement of eyewitness. Smith suggests that the latter is reserved for objects or events which may seem particularly incredible or controversial to the audience.[95]

One obvious example is the Egyptian labyrinth, which Herodotus wants his audience to believe is greater and the result of more labour than all the monuments of the Greek world put together (2.148.2) – it is easy to understand

[91] Konstan (1987) 67: 'The meaning here is not avid inspection or inventory, but a lively engagement with the world'. Konstan also suggests the word θεωρέω is used for Greeks and θεάομαι for non-Greeks, but this distinction is not quite borne out by the text given that θεωρέω occurs in the narrative four times, twice for Greeks (1.59.1, 8.26.2) and twice for non-Greeks (3.32.1, 4.76.2).

[92] See also Chapter 6 for Herodotus' use of *opsis* compared with that of his contemporaries, the Hippocratics and Presocratic philosophers.

[93] See, for example, Smith (1987) 113.

[94] Fowler (1996) 71-3; *FrGrHist* 765 F 29. See also Dewald (2002) 283 and Rösler (2002) 91.

[95] Smith (1987) 115.

that many direct eyewitness statements for the labyrinth would be needed to convince an incredulous Greek audience of this claim. Similarly, Herodotus' arguments about the origins of Heracles (from Egypt, not Greece) or his belief that the Greeks got their alphabet from the Phoenicians who came to Greece with Cadmus might be controversial and thus require a strong authorial guarantee in the form of eyewitness references to the temples of Heracles at Tyre (2.44) and the Cadmean writing in Thebes (5.59), respectively.[96] This is easily explicable in the context of the polemical climate in which Herodotus was working in the mid-fifth century BC, with different writers promoting their competing theories about the world.[97]

By contrast, the motif phrases – rather than being used to support or justify a particular (perhaps controversial) theory or line of argument – seem to play a more basic corroboratory role. They frequently occur in relation to temple dedications which commemorate a certain event, thus providing more reliable evidence that such events did indeed take place. Objects such as Croesus' many dedications at Delphi, or the chains in the Athenian acropolis from the Boeotian war (items which many of Herodotus' audience may have seen) merely provide physical, visible confirmation of Croesus' close links with the oracle, or Athenian victory in the war.

This is not to say that all direct eyewitness statements are made in relation to controversial material whereas the motif phrases are not. But it is relevant to note that these motif phrases are never used to refute information from other sources, only to confirm or add to it, and the same can be said for all the other present tense descriptions of objects in the text which amount to autopsy.

Arguably what Herodotus has done with these motif phrases is to invent a new language of autopsy, an efficient way of signalling to his audience that his autopsy

[96] See Hartmann (2013) 36-7, 39 on 5.59, suggesting that Herodotus is engaging here in polemic against Hecataeus who thought that the Greek alphabet had been brought to Greece by Danaus from Egypt. Hartmann argues that inscriptions played an important role for the ancient historian in contradicting traditional accounts or arguing against another authority. See also Hornblower (2013) 179 who agrees that 'such claims [i.e., at 5.59] to eyewitness investigation are used to introduce material which Herodotus knew was controversial'.

[97] See Chapter 6.

is at work without unduly interrupting the narrative by the insertion of an active first-person presence. The phrases act almost like a stamp of verification: an historical event is evidenced by a particular object or monument whose present-day existence is confirmed by the narrator to further substantiate the event. It is noteworthy that this motif is picked up and used by later authors in very similar contexts, perhaps most strikingly by Pausanias who deploys it throughout his *Periegesis*.[98]

In discussing the statements of direct eyewitness, much of the argument has focused on the strength of autopsy statements in the text with the narrator as the active voice – I saw – often with an emphatic ἐγὼ or αὐτός. But there are also a number of instances where Herodotus is the object of the sentence ('it appeared *to me*') or even where he removes himself all together ('[x] can be seen'). Whereas the passages in the active voice often have a polemical tone or provide a strong authorial guarantee, these other passages have a different feel.

In describing Croesus' gold bowl at Delphi, he states 'for it appears to me to be an extraordinary work' (ού γὰρ τὸ συντυχὸν φαίνεταί μοι ἔργον εἶναι – 1.51.3). By placing the bowl as the subject of the sentence, Herodotus makes its impact on the viewer far more powerful, the magnificence of the bowl striking the viewer with an almost visceral effect. The word order here, sandwiching Herodotus as viewer between the words describing the bowl (lit: 'for extraordinary it appears to me is the work'), serves to emphasise this effect as the grandeur of the bowl overwhelms its viewers.

He uses the same technique when describing the temple within the precinct of Leto at Buto (2.155.3, 2.156.1), the Scythian bowl at Exampaeus (4.81.3) and the rift in Thessaly (7.129.4). These passages show Herodotus prepared to give the physical objects themselves the main role and take a step back as narrator, perhaps to impress on his audience their magnificence and the impact of 'seeing for oneself'.

Occasionally Herodotus removes himself altogether and merely uses the passive mood of the verb 'to see'. In describing the iron spits dedicated by Rhodopis at Delphi (2.135.3), the temple of Bubastis at Bubastis (2.137.5) and in commenting

[98] For example, the anchor discovered by Midas (founder of the Phrygian city Ankora) 'was still there in my time in the sanctuary of Zeus' (ἦν ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἐν ἱερῷ Διὸς – 1.4.5).

on the lack of empty wine jars in Egypt (3.6.1), he uses the passive infinitive ἰδέσθαι ('to be seen'). Given the paucity of examples it is difficult to conclude whether this approach has any single purpose, especially as each instance has a different context.

In the case of the lack of wine jars in Egypt, Herodotus may be trying to convince his audience of this rather surprising statement and so the passive mood is employed to emphasise that 'no wine jars can be seen [by anyone]', i.e., it is not just Herodotus who did not come across any. This is then contrasted in the rhetorical passage which follows where Herodotus imagines his audience questioning where all the wine jars have gone, and he answers with the strong active voice of the narrator – this is something I myself can tell you about (ἐγὼ καὶ τοῦτο φράσω – 3.6.2). In the description of Bubastis it is the beauty of the temple and its position which overwhelms the viewer (ἡδονὴ δὲ ἰδέσθαι – 2.137.5), while in relation to Rhodopis' spits at Delphi Herodotus is perhaps playing on the double meaning of ἰδέσθαι as 'seen' and 'know'.

3.5: The Distribution of Autopsy References in the Text

As has been noted, the autopsy references in the *Histories* are not evenly distributed throughout the work. By far the majority of them (111) are found in the first four books which focus on non-Greek peoples and the more distant past, as compared with the last five books (thirty-five) which cover the Persian Wars.[99] Book 2 contains the greatest number of statements (fifty-nine) and it is no coincidence that this book concerns Egypt.

Egypt stood high in Herodotus' estimation for its extraordinary and numerous monuments and its concern for preserving the past, thus providing a worthy subject for his autopsy and fertile conditions for the practice of *historie*.[100] Several

[99] Book 1 (twenty-one); Book 2 (fifty-nine); Book 3 (twelve); Book 4 (nineteen); Book 5 (nine); Book 6 (six); Book 7 (eight); Book 8 (six); Book 9 (six). For a more granular breakdown by different types of autopsy reference, see Appendix C.

[100] See Lloyd (2002). Luraghi (2001b) 152 notes that Book 2 also contains the most prominent examples of *gnome* and particularly detailed statements of *akoe*, concluding that Herodotus' *historie* here reaches 'a peak of intensity ... [which] is supposed to convey ... [that] Egypt offered conditions for the practice of ἱστορίη that were better than anywhere else'.

other Greek writers had expressed opinions about Egypt, most notably Hecataeus, and Herodotus himself makes specific reference to them (e.g., Hecataeus' visit to Thebes – 2.143.1).[101] Herodotus' relationship with Hecataeus has been noted as being one of continuous critical dialogue rather than source and recipient.[102]

As Marincola, among others, has pointed out, the increased number of first-person authorial statements in Book 2 therefore plays a polemical role in attempting to outdo or disprove previous Greek accounts: the personal nature of Herodotus' investigation and direct contact with sources ensures that his narrative will be the most reliable and trustworthy.[103] Autopsy inevitably plays a crucial role in this exercise. As it provides the strongest form of evidence, the numerous autopsy statements in Book 2 place Herodotus' work head and shoulders above that of his predecessors and contemporaries for its accuracy, inviting the audience to place their faith in the narrator.

Another key reason why the majority of autopsy references are found in the earlier books is that these cover regions (and therefore physical phenomena) outside the Greek world which Herodotus' audience were less likely to have seen. The royal palace at Sais, the temple of Heracles at Tyre or the Scythian bowl at Exampaeus were places and objects probably outside the experience of most of his audience and thus it was important for Herodotus to vouch for their existence. By the time Herodotus reached the Persian War narrative in Books 7-9, he could assume that most of his audience were familiar with key sites such as Athens, Plataea and Thermopylae (and the events that took place there), with the result that as he was 'not now writing of distant lands and uncertain marvels, he [had] little need to

[101] See also 5.36, 5.125-6 and 6.137. For more on Herodotus' references to Hecataeus (especially the Thebes episode) see West (1991) who argues that the encounter with the priests was very likely a fabrication by Herodotus, a narrative device rather than an historical account.

[102] Lloyd (2007) 231. See also Lloyd (1975) 127-39 for detailed discussion of Herodotus' relationship with Hecataeus and a strong defence of Herodotus in the context of the tradition that Hecataeus was the more accurate investigator and rational thinker; Hornblower (2013) 139-41, 178 on evidence for Herodotus' interaction with Hecataean ideas in Book 5; Dillery (2018) in particular on how Herodotus distanced himself from Hecataeus.

[103] Marincola (1987) 128.

invoke autopsy'.[104] Further, he may have thought there was less need to show his (Greek) audience how to conduct an historical investigation into their own past.[105]

However, the picture is not quite so straightforward, for a quick glance at autopsy references by geographical location shows that there are plenty for the Greek world (even if not as many as for the non-Greek regions) with a particular focus on Delphi and Samos.[106] Notably, for places in the non-Greek world there are generally more direct eyewitness statements than indirect (or at least a near equal number), whereas for the Greek world the indirect statements predominate.

Thus for Delphi there are two direct statements, but fifteen indirect, and for Samos one direct statement but eight indirect, whereas for Scythia there are four direct and two indirect, or for Sais five direct and eight indirect (and for the whole of Egypt twenty-four direct and twenty-three indirect). This again suggests that it is the material with which his audience is less familiar which Herodotus needs to substantiate with more emphatic eyewitness statements. For Greek sites such as Delphi and Samos it is often sufficient to use a motif phrase, i.e., give a brief indication of his own autopsy to support his account without requiring the strong authorial presence a direct statement would provide.

3.6: The Purpose of Autopsy

This chapter has explored the many ways in which Herodotus deploys *opsis* in the metanarrative – its nuanced relationship with *akoe*, *gnome* and *historie*, its rich and varied vocabulary and the reasons behind the distribution of autopsy statements in the text. But what is its overall role and purpose in the *Histories* and what message is Herodotus trying to convey to his audience by using it as a source? One of its primary roles is, of course, as a key component of Herodotus' investigative

[104] Marincola (1987) 132 and at (1997) 101 n.109 noting further that there is a polemical aspect here, namely that Herodotus had 'no one to better' in his account of the Persian Wars in Books 7-9. This is also noted by Shrimpton (1997) 233 in the introduction to his collection of Herodotus' source-citations.

[105] Luraghi (2001b) 156: 'the discourse of ἱστορίη is clearly less prominent when Herodotus speaks of Greeks. The reason, I suppose, is that he feels no need to explain to the Greeks how it would be possible to gather information in their own environment'.

[106] See Appendix B. See Kosmetatou (2013) for discussion of Herodotus' meticulous research on the dedications at Delphi. See Irwin (2009) and Pelling (2011) for more on Herodotus and Samos.

method. As shown above, Herodotus reveals how *opsis* plays a crucial role in any enquiry, expanding, confirming or refuting other evidence, and (perhaps most radically of all, as will be shown in Chapter 6) how it can further our knowledge of the past.

The physical remains of the past – such as Sesostris' pillars, the Egyptian labyrinth or the many dedications in sanctuaries across the Greek world – invite the use of *opsis* to discover and interpret past events, and provide something more certain and solid (both literally and metaphorically) than the many different oral and/or written accounts which may confuse or deceive the casual enquirer. As Lateiner puts it, 'the visible monument commemorates the historical action; each one emphasises the primacy of *opsis*'.[107] Herodotus is at pains to show his audience how the physical remains of the past are vital to reconstructing a historical narrative and that the monuments left behind by individuals (such as Amasis or Rhodopis) tell us much about their status and achievements as well as how they wanted future generations to perceive them.

Some scholars have gone so far as to suggest that it was the experience of seeing many of these physical remains that provided the original spark for Herodotus' investigation. In Flower's exploration of Delphic traditions about Croesus, she postulates that it was a visit to the temple and viewing the many rich offerings dedicated there by the Lydian king which inspired Herodotus to discover more about this fascinating figure who clearly had a close relationship with the Greek world: Croesus' story becomes the first major narrative in the *Histories*.[108]

We should, therefore, consider references to objects in the text to be a crucial part of the narrative (around which oral traditions spring up and are preserved) rather than digressions from the main account.[109] Although it may be impossible to

[107] Lateiner (1987) 96.

[108] Flower (1991) 68. See Mari (2013) for a similar argument that the sight of historical objects such as the dedications at Delphi inspires the viewer to investigate the narratives behind them – a journey from the visible to the invisible. See Chapter 5 for more on this metaphor.

[109] Parke (1984) 212 also argues that Herodotus' visit to Delphi may have prompted him to investigate why Croesus made such generous offerings to Apollo and how it was that he suffered such a dramatic reversal of fortune. Parke, however, concludes that the story of Croesus 'testing' the oracles is clearly apocryphal and most likely a Delphic invention (217), not least because there

identify with any certainty the original seeds which prompted Herodotus' extraordinary and wide-ranging *historie*, it is a fair hypothesis that his experiences travelling in Greece, the Near East and Egypt led him to the realisation that *opsis* of man-made objects and natural phenomena can be used to draw conclusions about past events or postulate theories about the natural world.

Another role of *opsis* in the text is to highlight or emphasise important objects, places or events. When Herodotus wishes to draw attention to something particularly marvellous or significant to his narrative such as the Egyptian labyrinth or Apollo's temple at Delphi (the site of numerous historic dedications from Croesus' gold to the Greek memorials of the battle of Plataea) we find a profusion of autopsy references: four for the labyrinth; seventeen for the temple of Apollo.

In this role *opsis* acts rather like the Homeric *kleos*. In the Homeric poems, the hero's memory is preserved by *kleos* which the poet has the power to bestow by singing of his great deeds and thus ensuring he will not be forgotten by the current generation. Herodotus has adapted this idea of *kleos* for a fifth-century BC context: by bestowing his autopsy on particular objects, monuments or places, he decides what is worthy of his and his audience's attention and the ἔργα (both in the sense of the physical monuments themselves and the historical narratives to which they relate) that will be preserved. The preservation of the past is the justification for writing history. This is *kleos* applied to the ἔργα μεγάλα τε καὶ θωμαστά ('great and marvellous deeds of men' – proem) rather than to one man, Achilles.[110]

Thus Herodotus both places himself in the epic tradition but also develops and adapts that heritage for his own project. In this context, the use of the adjective ἀξιοθέητος highlights those objects that are particularly deserving of fame, either for their sheer beauty and workmanship (such as Amasis' breastplate – 2.182.1) or because they are testaments to human ingenuity and skill (such as the dykes on the Babylon plain – 1.184).

---

is clear evidence (including in the *Histories*) of Croesus making significant dedications at other temples such as Amphiaraus (also tested) and Ismenian Apollo at Thebes.

[110] See Smith (1987) 24 for more on the influence of *kleos* on the proem of the *Histories*; also Raaflaub (2010) 202 for the implied emphasis on *kleos* in the proem; and Barker (2009) 144 on the Homeric influence on the proem.

The autopsy references in the text are a large part of the 1,086 first-person statements in the *Histories*; Herodotus' 'glosses of *historie*'.[111] Many scholars have recognised that the frequent intrusion of the author into the narrative is a key way in which Herodotus establishes his authority. No longer was inspiration from the Muse enough to justify a version of events ('sing, Muse, of the rage of Achilles, son of Peleus...'; μῆνιν ἄειδε θεὰ Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος οὐλομένην – Homer, *Iliad*, 1.1);[112] in the age of proof where the natural philosophers, Hippocratics and Sophists were putting forward competing theories about the nature of the world and of man, Herodotus' audience would have demanded a different, verifiable form of narrative basis for his account.[113] Herodotus himself appears to be aware of this dividing line between the age of heroes and the age of men in his repeated use of the phrase 'the first of whom I/we know' (τὸν δὲ οἶδα αὐτὸς πρῶτον) to denote people or things of which he has some kind of actual knowledge.[114]

Given that (as argued above) *opsis* by and large emerges in the text as the most reliable source, bringing the investigator closest to the truth, Herodotus' autopsy statements must form a crucial element of his narratological authority. As we have seen, Herodotus often uses personal pronouns (ἐγὼ αὐτὸς) alongside words for seeing to underscore his personal guarantee: 'I myself have seen this, therefore you can believe that it is true' is the message to his audience.

It is therefore not surprising that Herodotus' autopsy is often directed at topics about which there has been controversy (such as the origins of Heracles or the carving of Sesostris) or authorial concern about a sceptical audience (such as the height of the crops in Babylon or the magnificence of the Egyptian labyrinth). There is, however, an irony in the fact that Herodotus' *opsis* becomes his audience's *akoe*: what he sees is converted into a narrative which his audience hears.

---

[111] Dewald (2002) 272; Munson (2001) 32.

[112] At the same time, it is fair to say that much of Odysseus' authority as an internal narrator in the *Odyssey* comes from his extensive travels and therefore eyewitness accounts of people and places. For more on this see Dougherty (2001) esp. 66. See Barker (2009) 144-202 on the differences between Homeric and Herodotean narrative authority.

[113] See Thomas (1997) and (2000) for more on this fifth-century BC context.

[114] This phrase occurs at least thirty times in the text: 1.5; 1.140; 1.142; 1.178; 1.193; 2.68; 2.157; 3.60; 3.98; 3.122; 4.18; 4.20; 4.42; 4.46; 4.48; 4.58; 4.152; 4.184; 5.119; 6.21; 6.112; 7.20; 7.111; 7.170; 7.238; 8.105; 8.124; 9.37; 9.64; 9.78.

This brings us to another significant aspect of *opsis* (and indeed of the text itself). For hand in hand with the role of *opsis* in establishing Herodotus' authority is the didactic nature of his autopsy. The *Histories* give us many opportunities to see Herodotus' investigative methods in action and there is a definite sense that he showing his audience 'how it is done', for example in the extraordinary description of his search for the origins of Heracles in Book 2 (discussed in the previous chapter) where he uses *akoe*, *gnome*, and finally *opsis* in a determined search for the truth, or in his use of visual comparisons (discussed above).[115] Luraghi has suggested that statements of 'meta-historie' can also be attributed to the need to 'articulate the rules of a new genre';[116] and as Dewald has pointed out, Herodotus clearly wants his readers to be aware of the difficulties of carrying out *historie*, the care that goes into the gathering, assessing and selection of material.[117]

Nor is Herodotus averse to leaving his audience to make up their own minds about whether to believe his account, or to judge between different versions of events – see, for example, the Egyptian stories about Rhampsinitus (2.123.1) or the Sybarite and Crotonian accounts of Doreius' involvement in their war (5.45.2).[118] Admittedly Herodotus' occasional claims that he is merely recording what he has heard may seem a little disingenuous given that he rarely shies away from passing judgement in other parts of the text. But arguably these passages serve to remind

[115] Raaflaub (2010) 201 emphasises the educational nature of the text and the way in which Herodotus seeks to make his audience critically aware; Dewald (1993) discusses how Herodotus demonstrates how easy it is to misinterpret objects, but often leaves his audience to read them. For the role of Heracles in the *Histories*, see Bowden (2005b).

[116] Luraghi (2006) 85: Herodotus has created this new genre of 'meta-*historie*' and therefore his first-person statements are 'as if inviting ... [the audience] to take part in a game whose rules they do not yet know exactly, while at the same time showing himself bound by those rules'. He sees this (87) as part of the creation of a new kind of authority when dealing with historical investigation, i.e., the author's *historie*, an authority which had been provided by the Muse(s).

[117] Dewald (1987) 153: Herodotus' clear authorial voice throughout the text, distinct from the narrative, is a key part of this demonstration. She has counted (151) forty instances where Herodotus interrupts the third-person narrative to question the truth of a source.

[118] 2.123.1: 'Anyone who finds such things credible can make of these Egyptian stories what they will. My job, throughout this account, is simply to record whatever I am told by each of my sources' (τοῖσι μέν νυν ὑπ᾽ Αἰγυπτίων λεγομένοισι χράσθω ὅτεῳ τὰ τοιαῦτα πιθανά ἐστι: ἐμοὶ δὲ παρὰ πάντα τὸν λόγον ὑπόκειται ὅτι τὰ λεγόμενα ὑπ᾽ ἑκάστων ἀκοῇ γράφω). 5.45.2: 'So this is the evidence produced by either side; anyone can agree with whichever of the two accounts he finds plausible' (ταῦτα μέν νυν ἑκάτεροι αὐτῶν μαρτύρια ἀποφαίνονται: καὶ πάρεστι, ὁκοτέροισί τις πείθεται αὐτῶν, τούτοισι προσχωρέειν).

the readers of their own responsibilities as investigators when using Herodotus' account as evidence for the past: they too should be weighing up his narrative, deciding whether he has provided enough proof for the events described and assessing the quality of his sources (whether *opsis* or *akoe*).

Other passages where he slips into the second person (see, for example, 1.199, 2.5, 2.29, 2.30, 3.12, 4.28) seem to co-opt the readers into the narrative and the investigation at hand, encouraging them to get involved. The adjective ἀξιοθέητος functions as a recommendation to go and look at an object. It should also be remembered that a contemporary (in particular Athenian) audience would have been familiar with narrative based on eyewitness reporting from Greek tragedy, not least in the form of the messenger speech, as Zeitlin has pointed out.[119] In addition, scholars have commented on the didactic role which tragedy played in providing a forum for exploring and debating the key political questions and themes of the day.[120]

In the majority of the passages discussed in this chapter, we have seen how *opsis* brings the investigator closest to knowledge. There is something very convincing about 'seeing for oneself' which induces the belief that one has found the truth about a certain event. Herodotus sometimes makes the link explicit, as, for example, when claiming that Chephren's pyramid is smaller than Cheops' (2.127) or the extent of Rhodopis' fortune (2.135). This idea is not unique to Herodotus: the link between sight and knowledge can be found in many other texts from the Homeric poems to the Presocratic and Hippocratic writers.[121] Indeed, the Greek language lends itself to this connection, the aorist of ὁρῶ ('see') being εἶδον ('I have seen') which is etymologically linked to εἰδέναι ('to know'): the idea being 'I have seen, therefore I know'.

---

[119] Zeitlin (1994) 143: the study of messenger speeches in Greek tragedy has shown the prominence of first-person eyewitness language; he argues that such language through its stamp of authenticity persuades the audience of the veracity of the report.

[120] See, in particular, Boedeker and Raaflaub (2005) 125: 'the tragic poet served as a teacher of his audience: not so much by providing specific advice, but by illuminating aspects of the process in a political culture where dialogue really did have immediate and immense consequences'.

[121] See, for example, *Odyssey*, 16.420: '...and one other thing I know because I saw it with my very own eyes' (ἄλλο δέ τοι τό γε οἶδα: τὸ γὰρ ἴδον ὀφθαλμοῖσιν). For more on these connections, see Chapter 6.

The two concepts are connected in the other direction too: a desire for knowledge prompts the exercise of *opsis* to obtain it. At 2.19.3, it is Herodotus' curiosity about the Nile's flooding that sparks his investigations on the subject: βουλόμενος είδέναι ἰστόρεον ('wishing to know about these things, I investigated'). It is the same impulse that prompts him to travel to Tyre and Thasos to see the temples of Heracles: καὶ θέλων δὲ τούτων πέρι σαφές τι είδέναι ἐξ ὧν οἷόν τε ἦν ('desiring to know about these matters as clearly as I could' – 2.44.1). We are left in no doubt that *opsis* puts the investigator on the path to knowledge, but also that the thirst for knowledge is the path to good investigative techniques.

In his research on the flooding of the Nile, Herodotus considers three theories which have been advanced by Greek thinkers who are dismissed as persons motivated by a desire to appear clever: βουλόμενοι γενέσθαι σοφίην (2.20.1). The contrast with Herodotus' own impulse in the previous sentence could not be more stark, made all the more so by use of very similar vocabulary: βουλόμενος είδέναι – the recognition that one lacks knowledge but desires to obtain it prompts the use of robust investigative methods which in turn lead to that knowledge, versus the desire to appear wise, thus producing false knowledge because it is based on the wrong kind of desire.[122]

This brings us to a crucial question: is the exercise of *opsis* sufficient to lead the investigator to the truth, or does it require something else? We get a hint at 2.5.1 that there might be more involved when Herodotus states that anyone can see that parts of the Egyptian land have been gained from the river, but then qualifies this: 'well, a man of intelligence at any rate' (ὅστις γε σύνεσιν ἔχει).[123] Just as that rather opaque fragment of Heraclitus warned that 'the eyes and ears of those who have barbarian souls are bad witnesses',[124] Herodotus implies that using *opsis* to obtain

[122] See Chapter 4 for a detailed discussion of desire (ἔρως) and sight (ὄψις).

[123] Lloyd (1988) 38 feels there is an element of polemic in this appeal to an objective view (it is clear enough to *anyone* of intelligence). There may also be a reference here to concepts familiar from the work of Hippocratics and natural philosophers – see e.g., Alcmeon: 'Man differs from the other animals because he alone has understanding, while the others perceive but do not understand'; ἄνθρωπον γάρ φησι τῶν ἄλλων διαφέρειν ὅτι μόνον ξυνίησι, τὰ δ' ἄλλα αἰσθάνεται μέν, οὐ ξυνίησι δέ (DK 24A5; Theophrastus, *On the Senses*, 25).

[124] κακοὶ μάρτυρες ἀνθρώποισιν ὀφθαλμοὶ καὶ ὦτα βαρβάρους ψυχὰς ἐχόντων (DK 22B107; Sextus Empiricus, *Against the Mathematicians*, VII.126).

knowledge is not as simple a process as it might first appear.[125] This idea is expanded and developed in the narrative of the text, where characters misinterpret, or are deceived by, the evidence before their eyes. What can the narrative of the *Histories* tell us about the nature of *opsis* and does its portrayal irredeemably complicate and damage its overall image in the text as a source of knowledge? It is to these questions we now turn.

[125] Lloyd (1975) 77-8 notes that the information obtained from primary sources such as autopsy can still be distorted by the 'mental processing' of the eyewitness: 'the assimilation of ... information [acquired through primary sources] is ... conditioned by the character of the individual mind which will comprehend the data within its own terms of reference, fit them neatly into its own set of concepts and record them in that form'.

Chapter 4
Opsis in the Narrative:
Victims of *Opsis*

ἐνθαῦτα ἀκούσαντα Καμβύσεα τὸ Σμέρδιος οὔνομα ἔτυψε ἡ ἀληθείη τῶν τε λόγων καὶ τοῦ ἐνυπνίου ... ἐσωφρόνησε, συλλαβὼν δὲ τὸ θεοπρόπιον εἶπε: ἐνθαῦτα Καμβύσεα τὸν Κύρου ἐστὶ πεπρωμένον τελευτᾶν.

'When Cambyses heard the name "Smerdis" he was struck by the truth of what Prexaspes had said and saw the true meaning of the dream ... he came to his senses, understood the oracle and said "This is the place where Cambyses the son of Cyrus is destined to die."'

Histories, 3.64.1, 5

4.1: Introduction

So far we have examined the vital role of *opsis* in the metanarrative and its use by Herodotus as a key source for his enquiry. Equally important and rich in complexity and detail, however, is the portrayal of *opsis* in the narrative of the *Histories*. Scholars have come to recognise the prominence of the visual in ancient narrative, for example by examining the visual character of epic and the different responses to this in later periods.[1] Furthermore, the use of *ekphrasis* in Classical literature has long been an area of study in its own right,[2] while visual spectacle

[1] See Lovatt and Vout (2013) for discussion which focuses on 'visuality' in the reading and reception of epic, both the images which are put before the audience's eyes and the vision of the characters in the narrative: 'Homer's ekphraseis and similes are ... a crucial part of epic's perfomative power, providing the reader/listener with a way of seeing; and a way of seeing beyond what the narrative alone can conjure' (19). This follows a rich vein of scholarship on the visual in Classical literature and art: see in particular Goldhill and Osborne (1994) on the intermarrying of Greek art and text; Elsner (2007) on visuality in the art and literature of the Roman Empire.

[2] One of the best modern descriptions of *ekphrasis* is given by Elsner (2007) 7: 'the literary device of describing people, situations or works of art in such a way as to bring them vividly to mind in the reader's or listener's mind's eye'. Famous examples are the shield of Achilles (*Iliad*, 18.478-608) or the coverlet on the marriage bed of Peleus and Thetis (Catullus, 64). For discussions of *ekphrasis* in Greek literature, see Lovatt (2013) 162-204 on *ekphrasis* in epic, Squire (2013) on Achilles' shield and its reception in Greek and Roman art and literature, Squire (2010) on bringing out the powerful visual nature of the ekphrastic epigrams inspired by Myron's cow and Zeitlin (1994) on the use of spectacle, ekphrastic scenes and visual language in Greek tragedy, in particular by

was a key element of Greek tragedy, ritual and religion, the statue of a god often being at the centre of cultic practice.[3] It also seems clear that the Greeks thought about narrative in a particularly visual way and that visualisation was a key part of Greek story-telling and rhetoric.[4] Indeed, the vividness of much of the *Histories* provides an almost visual experience for Herodotus' audience as we accompany him on his travels through space and time.

The next two chapters will explore the varied relationship that characters in the text have with *opsis*, recognising it as a source of information, a method of recording events, a propaganda tool, a weapon of deception, a trigger for momentous events, and occasionally exhibiting a dangerous desire to see 'too much'.

This chapter will largely focus on characters who misinterpret visual evidence, attempt but fail to employ *opsis* for personal gain, in some other way have a poor relationship with it, or merely do not recognise that their actions are triggered by *opsis* – those who might be called the victims of *opsis*. The next chapter will by contrast examine those instances where characters are successful in using *opsis* or in its interpretation. The purpose here is to reveal the more nuanced and multi-faceted nature of *opsis* in the narrative as compared with the metanarrative and to explore some of the questions that a comparison raises, in particular whether the apparent tensions between the two can (or should) be resolved.[5]

Euripides – she makes the point (139) that the figurative arts developed alongside the visual aspects of Attic drama. For a comparison of the representations of tragedy in art and drama, see Osborne (1997), Hall (2006) 97-141 and (2007) on the visual personification of *tragoidia* and Lissarrague (2007) in relation to shield iconography. For *ekphrasis* in Roman literature, in particular Catullus, 64, see Elsner (2007) 67-87. For a slightly different approach looking at the purpose of *ekphrasis*, see Goldhill (2007). See Purves (2010) 141-2 for a discussion of *ekphrasis* as a way of understanding Herodotus' interest in *thomata*, in particular, visual marvels.

[3] See Chapter 5 for a discussion of this aspect of Greek religion in the context of Peisistratus' return to Athens with 'Athena' (*Histories*, 1.60); also Versnel (1987) 46-7 on the statue of the god as physical representation of the deity's presence.

[4] See Webb (2009) in particular 19-28 for discussion of the visual impact of Greek narrative and rhetoric; the ability of writers from Homer to Xenophon to place a scene before the reader's / listener's eyes and thus turn listeners into spectators. Suzanne Saïd (2002) 117 makes the same point in relation to Herodotus' tragic qualities.

[5] On the problems of interpretation generally and the different levels of interpretation of the text (those of characters, narrator, audience) see in particular Baragwanath (2008) 1-3.

We are by now familiar with the role of *opsis* as an invaluable source for the investigator, usually providing the most reliable evidence and bringing us closest to knowledge. Yet there is one part of the investigative process which has been largely absent from the discussion so far – the interpretation of that visual evidence, i.e., how does one go about decoding the message of *opsis* to arrive at the 'truth'. The narrative of the *Histories* gives Herodotus the opportunity to demonstrate just how problematic that interpretative process can be. The main vehicle for illustrating this point is the appearance of dreams (another meaning of *opsis* is the 'vision' which is seen by the dreamer) to various characters who fail to interpret what they see, usually with disastrous consequences, although as will be shown there are several other types of *opsis* misinterpretation in the text.

While the role of *opsis* in providing the trigger for momentous events in the narrative serves to reiterate the value attached to seeing for oneself, the failure of key characters, especially Xerxes, to harness this power again exemplifies the difficulties in handling *opsis* successfully and also provides an important narrative device for Herodotus. A detailed analysis of *opsis* in the narrative of the *Histories* is therefore crucial for understanding its nature and function in the text as a whole.

4.2: Dreams in the *Histories*

4.2.1: Overview

Dreams are one of the most significant manifestations of *opsis* in the narrative of the *Histories*.[6] There are eighteen dream episodes in the text, some of which combine to form a sequence of several dreams (such as the extraordinary phantom which appears to Xerxes and Artabanus in Book 7) and all of which occur at key moments in the narrative and/or the characters' lives.[7] Dreams are a recurrent

[6] Dreams had a particular fascination for the Greeks and occur in Greek literature from the Homeric epics to tragedy and philosophy. See Shulman and Stroumsa (1999) 6, Holowchak (2002) 21-3, Harris (2009) 21 and Platt (2011) 254 for discussion of the development of the dream in Greek and Roman literature and the shift from divine (for example, in Homer) to more rational explanations for the cause of dreams (for example, in Heraclitus and the Hippocratic texts). Näf (2004) provides a comprehensive survey of dream interpretation. See Lovatt (2013) 206-16 for an exploration of dreams in epic as part of the female gaze or perspective; Harrison (2000a) on dreams in the *Histories* in the context of Herodotean religion.

[7] Depending on whether one chooses to count some dreams as separate, or part of the same sequence, scholars arrive at slightly different totals, but the key passages are: 1.34ff; 1.107-8;

theme throughout Greek literature, from epic to tragedy and history. Along with oracles and other divinatory signs, they are a channel of communication between men and gods, though often an ambivalent one.

Dreams in Herodotus (and indeed in much of Greek literature) are primarily visual experiences: the dreamers see a particular phenomenon such as certain events unfolding or a figure standing before them who delivers a message (although in this latter case the visual experience is combined with an aural one). Van Lieshout points out that there is not a single example of an exclusively auditive dream experience in the whole of extant classical Greek literature.[8] This is underlined by the fact that (as many scholars have noted) in the Greek language one 'sees' a dream rather than 'having' or 'dreaming' it: βλέπω ὄνειρον / ὄναρ ἰδεῖν. In other words it is a manifestation external to the dreamer who is usually a passive recipient.[9]

This is a phenomenon observable in Herodotus through to the works of Artemidorus and Galen and is still a feature of the modern Greek language, as observed by Stewart in his work on the dream and dreaming in (mostly nineteenth and early twentieth century) Greek culture, focusing on the island of Naxos: the verb 'to see' is used interchangeably for 'having' a dream and 'seeing' a vision, and it is not always easy to distinguish which one a Greek author is writing about.[10]

Furthermore, *opsis* is one of the most common words in the *Histories* for 'dream' and seems to mean the 'vision' that the dreamer sees. Herodotus often describes dreams as 'appearing to' the dreamer, and indeed in the majority of cases, the person in question is the passive recipient of the dream, watching a particular

---

1.120-1; 1.209-10; 2.139; 2.141; 3.30 and 3.65; 3.124-5; 3.149; 5.55-6 and 5.62; 6.107-8; 6.118; 6.131; 7.12; 7.14; 7.17 and 7.47; 7.19; 8.54. The Nasamones' divinatory practices also involve dreams (incubation): see 4.172.

[8] Van Lieshout (1980) 24.

[9] Dodds (1951) 105: 'A type of dream in which the dreamer is a passive recipient of an objective vision'. Therefore dreaming is an unusual kind of visual experience in that, from the metanarrative at least, we have come to expect seeing to be an active sensory exercise.

[10] Stewart (2012) 19: he argues that this lack of distinction between dreams and visions could indicate this is not an issue about which Greek authors are concerned. One might argue that the messenger dreams in Herodotus have more of the character of visions to modern eyes. See Stewart (2012) generally for a discussion of the prophetic nature of the dream in Greek culture.

vision which is occurring outside of his or her own internal experience (such as Astyages seeing a vine growing from his daughter's genitals and spreading over Asia, or Polycrates' daughter seeing him floating in the air) rather than actually participating in the action (such as Hippias sleeping with his mother, or Agariste giving birth to a lion).[11] In one case (Xerxes at 7.19), the dreamer even sees a vision of himself. This is a feature of the dream throughout Greek literature, most notably in Homer (Herodotus' most obvious precedent in terms of dream descriptions) where all the dreams in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are of this passive type.[12]

One notable feature of some dreams in Greek literature (including Herodotus) is the epiphany, where a figure appears to the dreamer and imparts a specific message.[13] This type of dream combines a visual and auditive experience as the dreamer both sees a figure standing over him and hears the message given.[14] The visual element of the epiphany is a key part of the manifestation of the divine in Greek religion, while the auditive element is yet another way in which gods and mortals may communicate (as well as oracles and other divinatory practices).[15] Often the dream figure is larger than human size, particularly beautiful and/or winged which signifies its divine origins.

---

[11] In fact these are the only two examples of 'active' dreams in the *Histories*. See Fornara (1971) 53-4 for discussion of Agariste's dream and what it may indicate about Herodotus' opinion of Pericles.

[12] The only exception might be the metaphor at *Iliad*, 22.199-200 where Achilles' pursuit of Hector around the walls of Troy is likened to the classic nightmare where a pursuer cannot catch the pursued and the latter cannot escape. For detailed analysis of the dream in Homer, see Messer (1918), Kessels (1978), Van Lieshout (1980), Pelling (2006b). For the parallels between Homer and Herodotus more generally, see Bowden (2005a) 68-9.

[13] See Harris (2009) 23-90 for general discussion of the epiphany dream in antiquity and its later demise; Platt (2015) for an overview of the role of epiphany in Greek culture; Versnel (1987) for a brief overview of the Graeco-Roman epiphany: he makes the point (50) that not all dream epiphanies in classical antiquity were visual experiences, but even where only auditory, they are usually described in visual language. Miracles were also an impersonal manifestation of the god's presence.

[14] See Platt (2011) 9-10 for a brief account of the history of scholarly interest in epiphany in Greek culture, (generally) for a discussion of the visual nature of Greek religious practice, the importance of epiphany in providing visual evidence of the gods' existence and an exploration of the visuality of Graeco-Roman epiphany in art and literature, especially in the Second Sophistic period.

[15] See Harrison (2000a) 82-92 on epiphanies in Herodotus. He points out that the epiphany is arguably the purest and most direct form of divination (82), (echoed by Platt (2015) 493) – even so, some kind of interpretation is usually required. See also Mikalson (2002) 189-90 on divine appearances and support in battles in the *Histories*, particularly during the Persian Wars.

All Homeric dreams are epiphanies and there are at least eight in Herodotus. In the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, the divine origin of dreams is made clear: they are sent by the gods (see, for example, Agamemnon's dream sent by Zeus (*Iliad*, 2.1) or Penelope's dream sent by Athena (*Odyssey*, 4.795-841)).[16] However, in Herodotus the origin of dreams is less clear – there is only one reference to a dream as a *daimon* (in relation to Cambyses' dream, 3.65) and the dream sequence experienced by Xerxes and Artabanus in Book 7 becomes a vehicle for a debate about the origin of dreams.[17]

The epiphany dream is part of the broader phenomenon of epiphany in ancient Greek culture which recognised the occasional entry of gods into the mortal realm, as is attested throughout Greek art and literature, although the noun ἐπιφάνεια only appears in the third century BC, contemporaneously with a literary genre celebrating the collected epiphanies of a god or goddess.[18] The epiphany of a god or goddess plays a significant role in epic where a deity may appear to a hero to advise him of a certain course of action, though the hero may not realise the divine nature of his guest (perhaps because the god adopts a disguise).[19] An individual hero also often has links with a particular deity, such as Odysseus with Athena, who may appear several times to impart guidance or instructions.[20]

However, Lovatt argues that often 'such encounters do not bring meaningful understanding, but rather activate processes of divine control'.[21] This therefore provides a parallel with dream epiphanies in the *Histories*, where divine instructions or warnings never seem to bring any greater understanding or insight to the recipient; on the contrary, they often prompt the dreamer to misinterpret a particular situation or take a disastrous course of action, most notably Xerxes at

[16] See Lovatt (2013) 206-16 for discussion of these dreams and Pratt (1994) for the interpretative problems of Penelope's dreams.

[17] For a discussion on the epiphanic nature of dreams in Classical literature as compared with the episodic view which was current by the early modern period in Europe, see Harris (2009).

[18] See Parker (2011) 10 for discussion and examples. Versnel (1987) 48-9 argues that it is not in fact possible to draw a clear distinction between epiphany 'proper' and dream epiphanies.

[19] See Versnel (1987) 45-6 on the physical similarities between gods and mortals which therefore could lead to confusion or ignorance about the deity's identity.

[20] For a discussion of epiphany in Greek epic, see in particular Lovatt (2013) 78-85.

[21] Lovatt (2013) 85.

the beginning of Book 7, where he decides to continue with his plans to invade Greece on the instructions of a dream figure. In the *Histories*, divine apparitions also manifest themselves at key points in battles or power struggles, such as the tall soldier at Marathon (6.117), the local heroes who chase the Persians out of the sanctuary at Delphi (8.38-9) and the woman who cheers on the Greeks at Salamis (8.84.2), which further underlines their connection with significant events.[22]

Epiphany also played a key role in cultic practice, the god appearing to suppliants in his/her temple to impart a message or bestow some kind of gift, and as part of festivals where the advent of the god into a city would be celebrated perhaps by way of a statue carried in procession by hand or on a chariot.[23] Similarly there is a fairly major role for epiphany in Greek tragedy, particularly in the plays of Euripides where the god or goddess often appears *ex machina* in the final scene.[24] Yet as Hornblower has highlighted, the portrayal of epiphany in poetry (particularly epic) is different from that in history as it contains an element of vivid narration which is lacking in the latter.[25]

This type of 'messenger dream' can also be linked to the ancient practice of incubation at shrines such as those of Asklepios where the person seeking guidance or a cure from the god slept in the temple or shrine in the hope of seeing the god in a vision or dream and receiving a message.[26] One example are the

[22] See Harrison (2000a) 83-4 on battle apparitions.

[23] See Parker (2011) 179-185 for the advent of the god into the city as one of the commonest features of Greek religious festivals; Sinos (1993) for discussion of epiphany in Greek culture in the context of Peisistratus' return to Athens (*Histories*, 1.60) and Chapter 5 for discussion of this episode.

[24] See Parker (1997) for a discussion of the role of epiphanies and the depiction of Greek religion generally in Greek tragedy. He notes that the appearance of the god at the end of a play would have been recognised by the spectators as a familiar convention (146).

[25] Discussed in Hornblower (2001) in the context of a comparison between epiphanies in Herodotus' Plataea narrative and those in Simonides' Plataea Elegy.

[26] See Petsalis-Diomedis (2010) for an overview of healing rituals in the cult of Asklepios – sleeping overnight in the sanctuary was the main one (26) and dreams were the key form of communication with the god. She underlines the importance of the visual nature of this cure: 'In the Asklepeion the sick body was constructed as the favoured and miraculous body through a visual discourse in which the pilgrims actively participated. The vision of transformation was enacted in the sanctuary in the present and it was hoped it would extend into the pilgrim's future in the incubatory vision and thereafter even beyond the sanctuary' (238); see also Graf (2015) 506-10.

experiences recorded by Aelius Aristides in his *Hieroi Logoi* in the second century BC; he sought cures partly through incubation at various healing sanctuaries in north-west Asia Minor, especially the Asklepeion at Pergamon where incubation allowed him to communicate with the god through divine epiphany.[27] Petsalis-Diomedis' discussion of the Severan-period Asklepios mosaic in the House of Asklepios on Kos makes this connection; the depiction of the god arriving on the island is comparable to a pilgrim seeing the god appear to him in a dream vision.[28] Further, the important role played by images of the god (the cult statue but also as depicted on votive offerings or dedications) in healing sanctuaries underlines the visual nature of a pilgrimage to, and healing experience at, these sanctuaries.[29]

Herodotus mentions incubation in relation to the Nasamones whose divinatory practice is to sleep on the graves of their ancestors in the hope of receiving prophetic dreams (4.172). Indeed, dreams in Greek culture can be seen as a form of divination.[30] In Book 2 of the *Histories*, the Egyptian pharaoh Sethos (also a priest of Hephaestus) sleeps in the temple in order to obtain advice on how to deal with an invading army of Arabians and Assyrians. Hephaestus appears to him in a dream and gives him reassurance that he will defeat the invaders with the god's help (2.141).

Some scholars have argued that incubation practices are the origin of the epiphany dream in Near Eastern, Greek and Roman culture; one can understand how the

---

[27] See Platt (2011) 260-66 for further discussion of this work, 44-8 on the iconography of incubation as found on fourth-century BC votive reliefs in healing sanctuaries; Petsalis-Diomedis (2010) 228-38 on Aelius Aristides in the context of the cult of Asklepios, healing sanctuaries, rituals and iconography, including the incubation practices at the Asklepeion at Pergamon. Dodds (1951) 111 notes the Panhellenic importance of the cult of Asklepios and the practice of incubation towards the end of the fifth century BC.

[28] Petsalis-Diomedis (2007) 283-7.

[29] See Petsalis-Diomedis (2006), in particular within the context of the Amphiareion on the border of Attica and Boeotia. She emphasises the role played by images of the god in the sanctuary in the pilgrim's experience of the god's presence and the healing process: 'The content of a votive relief ... presented the viewer with a condensed image of past miraculous contact, and through this visual signification encouraged him or her to contemplate that pilgrimage. Some reliefs ... depicted the past pilgrim's vision of the god and in this way the viewer shared in the miraculous epiphany' (213). Pilgrims often left an image of themselves (or of the relevant body part) as a votive offering to the god at the end of their time at the sanctuary.

[30] See Harrison (2000a) 122.

appearance of a god in his or her shrine might lead to the idea of divinely sent dreams in other contexts, but overall this is probably too simplistic an explanation for what is likely to have been a more complicated process.[31] A similar link is implied by Harris, who suggests that statues of the gods in temples (i.e., the physical visual manifestation of the deity) might be the origin, or at least explain the survival, of the epiphany dream.[32]

Thus the epiphany (and the epiphany dream) is a key method of communication between gods and mortals and in this sense can be seen as a form of divination on a par with oracular consultation and divinatory sacrifices. Oracles provide the most obvious method of communication with the gods and are a cornerstone of Greek religion. They are the only aspect of Greek religion to constitute a form of revelation and thus provide a tool for mortals to attempt to understand the divine will, although of course their messages can be misinterpreted (as Croesus discovers).[33] Dreams operate in similar fashion although in this case the divine message may not necessarily have been sought by its recipient.[34]

In Herodotus' *Histories* the words ὄψις, ὄνειρος and ἐνύπνιον are often used interchangeably (although ὄψις is more commonly used) to mean the 'dream' which appears in sleep (ἐν τῷ ὕπνῳ).[35] However, ὄψις is also combined with one

[31] See e.g., Van Lieshout (1980) 45 and Harris (2009) 39. For more on the links between Greek dreams and Near Eastern culture see Flannery-Dailey (2004) 69-77; also Flower (2008) 24-6 for discussion of the Near Eastern origins of Greek divination practices. See Oppenheim (1956) for an overview of dreams in Near Eastern literature and culture; incubation is discussed at 187-8. For a more general overview of incubation practices in the ancient world, see Patton (2004).

[32] Harris (2009) 38-9. By contrast he thinks (39) that incubation is unlikely to have been the source of the epiphany dream because incubation could be practised by anyone, whereas the epiphany dream was something of a 'princely prerogative'. One could counter this, however, by suggesting that for the god to make the effort to step outside the bounds of the temple precinct on an unsought visit, the recipient had to be of royal or noble birth.

[33] See further Parker (2011) 13-16 and 57 on the role of divination and oracles in Greek religion; also Dillery (2005) on the role of *chresmologoi*, *manteis* and their reception in archaic Greek society (in particular their relationship with tyrants); Bowden (2003) on the role of *chresmologoi*, *manteis* and the interpretation of oracles in Athenian society and (2005a) on the role of the Delphic oracle in particular.

[34] 'In sleep every individual becomes a kind of seer': Parker (2011) 66; see also 127-144 for a discussion of the use of sacrifice as a bridge of communication between gods and men.

[35] Hollmann (2011) 78 argues that the different words used for dreams do not indicate different types of dreams.

of the other two words to form the phrase ὄψις τοῦ ἐνυπνίου / ὀνείρου [ἐν τῷ ὕπνῳ εἶδε] (lit: 'he saw a vision of a dream in his sleep') which again very much emphasises the visual quality of the dream.[36] This contrasts with later usage where different words for dream were specifically identified as having distinct meanings.

In particular, in his *Oneirocritica*, written sometime in the mid-second to early third century AD, Artemidorus denotes ὄνειρα as dreams which are prophetic, whereas ἐνύπνια are insignificant dreams which merely reflect the dreamer's present concerns – a 'recollection of things that are' (ὑπόμνησιν τῶν ὄντων – 1.3).[37] Such a distinction is not in evidence in the *Histories*. This may be a sign that the text reflects an earlier stage in the development of the language of dream-interpretation or simply an indication that Herodotus does not wish to delve too deeply into a debate on the origins of dreams; we know from the contemporary Hippocratic corpus and the views expressed by Artabanus in Book 7 of the *Histories* that such a debate was current in his day.[38]

In large part, dreams in the *Histories* only appear to key figures in the narrative: Croesus, Astyages, Cyrus, Sabacos, Sethos, Polycrates (via his daughter), Otanes, Hipparchus, Hippias, Datis, Agariste, Xerxes and Artabanus (disguised as Xerxes). Further, nearly all these figures are non-Greeks (even Hippias and Hipparchus are to some extent non-Greek figures by virtue of being tyrants and because of their Persian connections) and of royal or high status (the only exception in both cases being Agariste, although as mother of Pericles she has a higher historical status than most women).[39] As we will see, one of the main reasons for this is the way in

[36] The words cannot mean quite the same thing here: ὄψις can be characterised as the actual vision which is seen; ὄνειρος / ἐνύπνιον as the whole dream experience itself. The phrase occurs seven times in the text. Flannery-Dailey (2004) 64 considers ὄνειρος to indicate the dream-messenger.

[37] For a full discussion of, and detailed commentary on, Artemidorus' *Oneirocritica*, see Harris-McCoy (2012). See Platt (2011) 275-87 for discussion of Artemidorus' views on dreams in the context of a study of epiphany in Greek culture.

[38] However, Dodds (1951) 106-7 makes the point that the fundamental distinction in Greek antiquity was between significant and insignificant dreams, not between different types of dreams as such; rather, different types were recognised within the class of significant dreams. As discussed below, the fact that Herodotus chooses not to mention them does not mean he would not have recognised the existence of many everyday insignificant dreams.

[39] See Hornblower (2013) 172. Harris (2009) 25 notes that the first instance of an epiphany dream appearing to someone of less than royal status (Socrates) is recorded in Plato's *Crito*, 44ab.

which Herodotus uses dreams as a narrative device to signify an imminent dramatic event and thus mark a key turning point in the story; in particular, the misinterpretation of dreams is usually a forewarning of imminent disaster for the recipient. As one of the recurrent themes of the *Histories* is the fall of non-Greek rulers, it is no surprise to find such a correlation.

Konstan has argued that Herodotus characterises non-Greeks as looking at things in a different way, with a sense of wonder or amazement but without an appreciation of underlying meaning, perhaps reflecting their desire for wealth or material gain of some kind rather than knowledge.[40] Dewald adds that non-Greek rulers seem to suffer from a practical kind of ignorance which triggers their downfall, such as Astyages' decision to put Harpagus in charge of his army or Darius' failure to understand the Scythians, although she concedes that the same could be said of the Ionians.[41]

In the religious context, it is notable that we find non-Greek rulers attempting to access divine knowledge in ways which would have been unthinkable to Greeks, perhaps the most famous example in the *Histories* being the testing of different oracles by Croesus in an attempt to discover which are accurate. He makes tortoise and lamb stew in a bronze cauldron and then sends out messengers to six oracles to ask them what he is doing (1.46-49). Such an act would have been viewed as impious by the Greeks, implying that the gods might not have complete knowledge. An inaccurate answer would be due to other influences (such as bribery) or the limitations of the human interpreter of the divine word (such as the Pythia at Delphi) or a failure of interpretation by the recipient.[42]

---

[40] Konstan (1987). In this context he notes (69) that the word for seeing when used for non-Greeks is generally θεάομαι which contains the meaning of gazing with wonder thus implying a motive for looking that differs from the Greek desire to learn more about the world. See further Chapter 3; Herodotus does use θεάομαι on one occasion to describe his own autopsy in relation to the Egyptian labyrinth, at 2.147.5.

[41] Dewald (1985) 49-50, 53.

[42] See Flower (2008) 147-52 for discussion of this episode: 'The idea of testing an oracle was foreign to the Greek mentality. The Lydian Croesus ... seems to have been completely unaware of the impiety involved in his act from the Greek point of view'. Flower does, however, note that it was accepted Greek practice to ask the same question of more than one oracle. Examples of bribery of the Pythia can be found in Herodotus 5.63, 5.90-1, 6.123 (by the Alcmaeonidai) and 6.66 (by Cleomenes). For the concept of piety in ancient Greece (Athens in particular), see Bowden (2015).

Indeed, the episode has an element of hubris in it – an attempt by Croesus to test the gods and therefore undermine their authority – which in turn feeds into the picture drawn by Herodotus of Croesus as a doomed ruler. To a certain extent, therefore, the misinterpretation of dreams by non-Greek rulers may be part of a broader theme in the *Histories* of poor communication between foreign kings and the gods and the former's frequent failure to understand the divine will.

4.2.2: Structure of the dream in the **Histories** *and initial comments on its origins*

Several themes emerge from a close study of dreams in the text. In terms of their structure, the vast majority of dreams involve the sleeper either seeing a vision (*opsis*) (the visionary dream) or being visited by a messenger in human form who delivers instructions or commands (the epiphany or messenger dream). Upon waking, the sleeper tries to interpret the dream (occasionally, as in the case of Astyages, with the help of professional dream-interpreters) before deciding on a certain course of action, more often than not in an attempt to avert the events which the sleeper believes the dream foretells, usually with dire consequences.

The visionary type of dream ought to prove harder to interpret than one in which an actual message is delivered, but as we see with Sabacos and Xerxes, the message still has to be interpreted – are the instructions really given with the welfare of the recipient in mind, or are they a trick to put the dreamer on a self-destructive course of action?

Several of the visionary dreams involve the motif of a figure or object growing larger or covering a geographical area: in his first dream, Astyages sees his daughter's urine flood Asia and in the second a vine grows from her genitals and overshadows the same continent (2.107-8); Cyrus sees the figure of Darius with wings growing from his arms, one wing overshadowing Asia, the other Europe (1.209-10); Cambyses is told that his brother Smerdis is sitting on the throne with his head touching the sky (3.30); Xerxes sees himself wearing an olive wreath which overshadows the whole world (7.19). All these dreamers are monarchs and

this motif is clearly a metaphor for regime change (or expansion), though not necessarily in the way the dreamer anticipates.[43]

One might compare this to Clytemnestra's dream in Sophocles' *Electra* in which she sees Agamemnon holding a leaf-sprouting sceptre which casts a shadow over Mycenae, clearly presaging Orestes' return to avenge his father's death (*Electra*, 417-23). This theme continues in the messenger dreams where the figure comes to the dreamer and 'stands over' (ἐπιστάσα / ἐπιστάντα) him, showing the potentially threatening nature of the figure and the vulnerability of the dreamer who is lying down, emphasised by the fact that the figure is often larger than human form (μέγαν – 5.56.1 and 7.12.1).[44]

As previously mentioned, the vast majority of the dreams in Herodotus are of the passive type, i.e., they either involve the dreamer watching a vision or sequence of events unfolding before him, or a messenger figure visits the dreamer and imparts instructions or some kind of warning. However, as noted by Hollmann, ironically these passive dreams are usually the motivation for (dramatic) action by the dreamer.[45]

The origin of the vision or messenger is rarely commented upon. Cambyses, on realising that he has misinterpreted his dream about a messenger telling him 'Smerdis' was sitting on the throne (the Smerdis in question was in fact the Magus and not his brother as he had assumed) cries out that the dream was his δαίμων (personal deity) which had been the messenger (ἄγγελος) (3.65). Similarly, Croesus on learning of the death of his son refers to his dream as a warning from the gods: 'responsibility lies with one of the gods, who even warned me some time ago what was going to happen' (ἀλλὰ θεῶν κού τις, ὅς μοι καὶ πάλαι προεσήμαινε τὰ μέλλοντα ἔσεσθαι – 1.45.2). Sethos interprets his dream of a man standing over

[43] See Harrison (2015a) 21-2 on these dreams as premonitions of conquest. Possibly the olive wreath is a reference to the future growth of Athenian power (the olive branch being one of the symbols of Athens). It is perhaps also significant that a shoot of the sacred olive tree is the first thing to reappear on the Acropolis in Athens the next day after Xerxes' forces have burnt it down (8.55).

[44] See Hornblower (2013) 174, commenting on 5.56.1: in epiphanies and dreams gods usually 'stand over' humans.

[45] Hollmann (2011) 77.

him and advising him to cut in half all the Egyptian priests as an attempt by the gods to deceive him into committing sacrilege so he might be punished (2.139).

The culmination of dreams in the *Histories*, the extraordinary dream sequence of Xerxes in Book 7 (which includes a debate between Xerxes and Artabanus about the divine origin of dreams) has sparked much controversy among scholars, in particular as to what extent it is reflective of Herodotus' own view on the subject. Certainly a divine origin for dreams is made far less explicit in Herodotus than in Homer, which some scholars have attributed to the rise in rationalism by the mid-fifth century BC, yet we cannot conclude that Herodotus rejects a belief in god-sent dreams.[46] We will return to this question later on in the chapter, but for now it is worth noting that a divine origin is certainly not made explicit for every dream although (apart from Artabanus' rationalist theory) no other origin is suggested.

4.2.3: Interpretation and fulfilment of dreams in the Histories

For every dream in the *Histories* which the dreamer tries to interpret, he either misinterprets it, ultimately ignores it or fails to recognise in time the event which constitutes the fulfilment of that dream.[47] Indeed for many dreams the following pattern can be discerned: the dreamer considers the dream but settles on an interpretation that is incorrect; the dreamer then takes action based on that misinterpretation in order to avoid certain events which he believes the dream foretells (this is often a moment of dramatic irony for the audience); and there then follows the tragedy of the final realisation (by the dreamer and/or the audience) of the dream's true meaning when the events, which in many cases the dreamer has helped to bring about, eventually occur.

As noted above, this pattern is not dissimilar to that seen in the (mis)interpretation of oracles, the most obvious example in the *Histories* being Croesus' misinterpretation of the Delphic oracle's prophecy that by attacking

[46] See Frisch (1968) 48 and Flannery-Dailey (2004) 69ff.

[47] Sabacos (2.139) would be the obvious exception, but even in his case it is unclear whether his interpretation was correct, only that no harm befell him as a result of fleeing Egypt. We cannot be sure what would have happened had he followed the dream's instructions to cut the Egyptian priests in half.

Persia he would destroy a great empire (his own) and his tragic grief in the famous pyre scene (1.53, 86).[48]

Astyages and Cambyses provide clear examples of this pattern. Astyages first dreams that his daughter Mandane's urine has flooded the whole of Asia (1.107). We are not told how he interprets this dream, but he is sufficiently concerned to marry her to a man 'outside the clan', i.e., to the Persian Cambyses and not to a fellow Mede. In his second dream which occurs after the marriage, Astyages sees a vine growing from Mandane's genitals and overshadowing Asia which the Magi interpret (correctly) as foretelling that Mandane's son will rule in his place (1.108).[49] Astyages therefore arranges for the child to be killed at birth by handing him over to his most trusted henchman, Harpagus, who in turn gives the child to a herdsman to expose on a mountain.

However, the herdsman does not expose him but brings him up as his own child. When the child (Cyrus) is discovered ten years later playing at being a king with his friends, the Magi incorrectly interpret this as the fulfilment of Astyages' dream with the result that he allows the child to live. However he punishes Harpagus for failing to carry out his commands by killing Harpagus' own son and serving him up as a gruesome feast. Many years later Harpagus gets his revenge by inciting Cyrus to revolt and overthrow Astyages and so the event foretold by the original dreams finally comes to pass.

---

[48] See Harrison (2000a) 122-57 for a discussion of oracles and dreams as parallel divinatory phenomena. In particular, he notes that the pattern of 'rejection, forgetfulness or mistaken interpretation ... [being] followed by surprise fulfilment and repentance' is common to all types of prophecy and divination (129). However, there is also evidence of greater scepticism regarding the reliability of oracles in this period: see Bowie (2009) 209-10. Just as with dreams, the fact that Herodotus focuses on oracles that are misinterpreted does not exclude the possibility that there were many more straightforward oracles whose messages were easily understood by their recipients. Grethlein (2013) 203 notes the dramatic irony often inherent in Herodotean oracles in the context of his argument for a teleological structure of the text.

[49] For detailed commentary on these dreams see Pelling (1996). Both Pelling (1996) 74 and Asheri (2007) 157 note that Herodotus is likely to be drawing on genuine Near-Eastern sources here: urine symbolises the birth of a child in Assyrian sources, while the vine was a symbol of success and salvation in the East. However, Chiasson (2012) 220-1 points out that the narrative deployment of these dreams (dynastic dreams as part of the birth myth of a great leader) also taps into a rich tradition of Hellenic storytelling on birth myths.

The great irony here is that the agent (Harpagus) whom Astyages uses to avoid the event foretold by his dream (his deposition by Cyrus) becomes the agent of Astyages' destruction and the means by which the dream is fulfilled, although Astyages is fairly sanguine at his ultimate defeat (1.129). By acting to avoid the event foretold by his dreams, Astyages has in fact brought it about.[50] Herodotus does not signal this interpretation of the sequence of events, allowing the narrative to speak for itself, but the audience was no doubt aware that the exposure of royal babies is rarely a successful enterprise (see, for example, the stories of Cypselos, Oedipus or Telephos).

There are obvious parallels with the Oedipus story and the genre of tragedy more generally, both in the attempted (but failed) exposure of a royal infant prophesised to usurp a current ruler (Oedipus by an oracle, Cyrus by two dreams) and the tragic irony of actions taken to avoid a disaster serving to ensure it.[51] One might compare this to Oedipus' determination in the first part of Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannos* to root out the evil which is polluting Thebes, not realising that he is in fact its source: the irony of Oedipus' insistence on including his own house in the search is not lost on the audience (ἐπεύχομαι δ', οἵκοισιν εἰ ξυνέστιος ἐν τοῖς ἐμοῖς γένοιτ' ἐμοῦ συνειδότος, παθεῖν ἅπερ τοῖσδ' ἀρτίως ἠρασάμην – 249-51).[52]

The clearly tragic nature of Astyages' actions exemplifies the parallels between the misinterpretation of dreams in the *Histories* and Greek tragedy, especially because the experiences of the characters involved are strongly evocative of the latter.[53] The pattern of dreams in tragedy, warning of a fulfilment which is impossible to avert despite all human effort, finds its echo in the *Histories*. More generally, many of the main themes in the *Histories* – the rise and fall of great dynasties and

[50] As Lang (1992) 204 puts it, like many other dreamers in the text, Astyages has 'earned' the fulfilment of his dream by trying to avoid it.

[51] Exposure of a baby and its later return is a common tragic theme. See also Ion in Euripides' *Ion* and Paris in the *Alexandros* of Euripides and Sophocles.

[52] However, Astyages appears remarkably calm at his usurpation. Similarly, despite all he has suffered, Oedipus emerges at the end of *Oedipus Tyrannos* as a strong character who is not in fact cast out of Thebes by Creon; for more on the ambiguities of the end of the play, see Burian (2009).

[53] For a useful introduction and overview of the links between Herodotus and Greek tragedy, see Saïd (2002) and Griffin (2006). On the links between dreaming and Greek drama, see also Hall (2006) 16-18 who notes that Artemidorus records several instances of people dreaming about playing dramatic roles or reciting speeches from plays.

empires, the vagaries of human fortune, hubris leading inevitably to ruin, warners and wise advisers who are ignored (Solon and Artabanus equate to Teiresias and Calchas) – are obviously familiar from tragedy, but there are particularly strong resonances with tragic figures in the misinterpretation of dreams by Croesus, Cambyses, Xerxes and the consequences of those misinterpretations, especially in the use of dramatic irony.

Cyrus' successor, Cambyses, is perhaps the typical example of a tragic figure in this sense: his hubris in committing any number of crimes against humans and gods; his murder of his brother Smerdis prompted by the misinterpretation of a warning dream; his wounding in exactly the same part of the body (the thigh) where he had sacrilegiously stabbed the Egyptian god Apis; his ultimate realisation of the true meaning of his dream and the consequences of his actions expressed in his final bitter lamentation. Such episodes are also prime examples of the way in which events unfold through a mixture of human and divine agency, another similarity with – particularly Sophoclean – tragedy.

The extent to which Herodotus borrowed from or was interacting with contemporary Greek tragedy has been a topic of much debate among scholars and we know, for example, that he was familiar with and borrowed from Aeschylus' *Persians*. There are also clear links between the *Histories* and Sophocles' plays.[54] Ostwald has argued that the two share the same world view; he suggests that both men see events as being shaped by individuals who are powerful but are operating within a framework over which they have little control. So however well-intentioned or logical are their motives for action, they cannot ultimately avert their divinely-controlled fate – for Oedipus, Ajax or Creon read Croesus, Xerxes or Cambyses.[55] As we will continue to see, the links with the Oedipus story are particularly strong for Herodotus' characters, perhaps not surprising given that, as

[54] For a good comparison, see Saïd (2002) 137-45. For some of the key differences between the two accounts, see Pelling (1997c).

[55] Ostwald (1991) 143-7: 'human agents [are] placed in situations in which they are constrained to act in ways which are bound to lead to failure, because they do not recognise until it is too late the limits which their humanity has set for them' (146-7).

Burian points out, it is the archetype of the tragic tale; at least eleven other Greek plays called *Oedipus* in addition to that of Sophocles are known to have existed.[56]

Raaflaub sees another tragic element in Herodotus' approach, namely that he uses past events to illuminate and comment on the present, just as the tragic poets deployed myth to analyse and interpret contemporary political problems. Both share a didactic element, a particularly interesting connection given the arguably didactic nature of Herodotus' use of *opsis* in the narrative (explored further in the next chapter).[57] Griffin in turn points out that both draw extensively on myth.[58]

Hence there are multiple parallels, but to return specifically to Cambyses, his dream that 'Smerdis' is sitting on the Persian throne with his head touching the sky is a classic case of misinterpretation.[59] Cambyses believes the dream is telling him that his brother Smerdis has rebelled against him. He therefore has his brother killed (3.30), when in fact it is the Magus (also called Smerdis) who ultimately usurps him (3.61). Arguably, Cambyses' action helps to bring about the events foretold by the dream because it leaves a power vacuum back in Susa and provides further proof of Cambyses' madness which in turn encourages the Magi to revolt. Herodotus delays discovery of the dream's true meaning by several chapters (3.30 to 3.64), thus creating greater dramatic tension until Cambyses (and the audience) discover his terrible mistake.

The moment of realisation for Cambyses is very powerful: Καμβύσεα ... ἔτυψε ἡ ἀληθείη ... τοῦ ἐνυπνίου (lit: 'the truth of the dream hit Cambyses' – 3.64.1). It is made all the more effective by ἡ ἀληθείη ('the truth') being the active force. He is made desolate by his innocent brother's murder: ἀπέκλαιε Σμέρδιν, ἀποκλαύσας

[56] Burian (2009) 100-1.

[57] Raaflaub (1987) 231. The extent to which the Persian War narrative may be read as a commentary on contemporary Athenian imperialism is discussed below. For the role of tragedy in commenting on contemporary events, see Bowie (1997) who cautions that clear contemporary references are few. For the broader question of interaction between Greek drama and society, see Hall (2006).

[58] Griffin (2006) 47.

[59] The image of the head touching the sky is highly symbolic in oriental monarchies such as those of Egypt and Persia, although it also occurs in Greek mythology (such as the story of Atlas): see further Asheri (2007) 430.

δὲ καὶ περιημεκτήσας τῇ ἀπάσῃ συμφορῇ ('he was overwhelmed with grief for Smerdis, weeping aloud and devastated by the whole disaster' – 3.64.2).

This violent clarity is very similar to that in Greek tragedy when the protagonist finally discovers the truth or understands the terrible consequences of his or her actions. Asheri has compared Cambyses here to Sophocles' Oedipus, and indeed Oedipus' cry of final realisation is recalled, ominously hinting at his imminent blinding: 'Alas! All out! All known, no more concealment! O Light! May I never look on you again!' (ἰοὺ ἰού: τὰ πάντ' ἂν ἐξήκοι σαφῆ. ὦ φῶς, τελευταῖόν σε προσβλέψαιμι νῦν – 1182-3).[60] Cambyses comments that it is not within man's power to deflect his destiny, which chimes with the idea that Greek tragedy also reveals more general truths about the human condition and underlines the apparent pointlessness of attempting to avert the events foretold by dreams (for more on which see below).

The Persian king may in fact be lending Herodotus his voice here. The sentiment certainly fits with one of his key narrative themes – the unavoidable cycle of human fate, as epitomised by the Lydian king, Croesus. Versnel argues that Herodotus fails, however, to endorse the idea that man's prosperity (as exemplified by Croesus or Polycrates) provokes divine envy and for that reason the eventual downfall of the individual in question is inevitable. Polycrates does in fact attempt to avert tragedy by throwing away his most prized possession (his ring), but its return underlines the pointlessness of the exercise and tragedy of his situation. Thus in this sense the protagonists cannot be blamed for misinterpreting oracles or dreams and failing to avert their fate.[61] While this seems clear for

[60] Asheri (2007) 461. Although this may be contrasted with Jocasta's more gradual understanding of, and horror at, the truth.

[61] Versnel (2011) 179-212, especially 189, 196-7. He suggests that Herodotus' portrayal of the divine will is in effect deliberately inconsistent to provide the broadest scope for explanation of events; scholars should not try to save Herodotus from these inconsistencies. See also Mikalson (2002) 192-3 on the idea of the 'necessity' of some events and Greek reluctance to hold the gods responsible for human misfortune; however, he recognises a role for hubris in the downfall of certain key characters such as Croesus, Polycrates and Xerxes.

Polycrates, arguably divine envy plays some role, as made explicit in the Croesus narrative when Herodotus refers to νέμεσις falling upon him (1.34.1).[62]

Mikalson recognises that in the *Histories*, dreams along with oracles, *manteis* and omens invariably prove to be accurate even if at first their message is unclear or misleading.[63] This, however, underlines the human inability to know the divine will given that, in the case of dreams at least, all are misinterpreted by their recipients; indeed it could be argued that this forms part of a Herodotean acceptance that the purpose of divine action is always ultimately unclear.[64] Harrison also underscores that many of the key themes evoked in the *Histories* (which are familiar from Greek tragedy and illustrated in particular by these dream episodes, the seeds of which can also be found in Solon's work) would have been very familiar to Herodotus' contemporaries, but we should not expect to find a consistent framework into which each of these ideas fits.[65]

Croesus' dream is that his son Atys will die from wounds caused by an iron spearhead (1.34). This is hardly a difficult message to interpret, but Croesus' mistake is a failure to anticipate that the spear could be thrown by a friend rather than an enemy: when he allows his son to go on the boar hunt with guest-friend Adrastus who is supposed to be protecting the boy, the danger comes not from an ambush by bandits (which is Croesus' concern) but from Adrastus whose iron spear misses the boar but kills Atys. The irony is not lost on Herodotus' audience:

---

[62] As noted, for example, by Griffin (2006) 48. Saïd (2002) 146 sees this divine jealously as a translation into religious terms of the limitation and instability of the human condition and in particular human happiness.

[63] Mikalson (2002) 195-6. See Flower (2008) 145 on Greek faith in the accuracy of oracles in contrast to the distrust of their human interpreters (*chresmologoi*); Bowden (2005a) 72 noting that 'the readers or audience know that the oracles will turn out to be true even if the enquirer in the story either rejects or does not understand them'; Burket (2005) more generally on Greek and Roman attitudes to divination. Oracles, though, were usually ambiguous and therefore by their very nature had to be interpreted and even debated by the *demos* in the case of Athens; see Bowden (2003) 272-4 on the debate in the Athenian assembly on the famous wooden wall oracle from Delphi relating to the battle of Salamis (*Histories*, 7.139-43).

[64] See Scullion (2006) 204 on this point; also Harrison (2000a) 191-2 on the limits and complexities of human knowledge about the nature of the gods and divine will, although he also notes Herodotus' belief that divination could provide a genuine means of obtaining knowledge given that ultimately the information which is provided by the gods through divination is accurate (130). The problem is one of interpretation rather than quality of information.

[65] Harrison (2000a) 39-40.

Atys is killed not only by a man whom Croesus has welcomed into his home as a guest, but a guest who has also been purified by Croesus for the crime of killing his own brother.[66] Though warned of his son's death, Croesus is still instrumental in bringing a murderer into his home who kills his son (even if accidentally). Adrastus' suicide provides the culmination of this particular tragedy.

Here Herodotus clearly presages the impending disaster so that we know from the beginning that Croesus will be unable to avert the event his dream foretells: ἔλαβε ἐκ θεοῦ νέμεσις μεγάλη Κροῖσον ('a great divine anger [lit: nemesis] fell upon Croesus' – 1.34.1) – after Solon's visit, Croesus is punished for arrogantly believing that he is the happiest man in the world, fulfilling both the dream's prophecy and (partially) Solon's warning. Thus this dream is very much part of the 'cycle of fortune' theme in the *Histories*, first referenced in the early chapters of the work (its misinterpretation by Croesus serving to underline Solon's point that human fortune is inherently unstable) as well as fitting in with another Herodotean motif, that sanctions inevitably follow the overstepping of natural boundaries.[67]

Croesus' story picks up two key tragic themes: the hubristic belief that the protagonist is somehow above the restrictions or rules of normal society (e.g., Creon in Sophocles' *Antigone* who refuses to allow Antigone to bury her brother's body and then has her killed for doing so); and the idea that a crime committed in one generation must be paid for by the perpetrator's descendants (in Aeschylus' *Oresteia*, the descendants of Atreus must pay for his killing of his brother Thyestes' children and feeding them to him, just as Croesus pays for Gyges' crimes).

Once again clear parallels with Oedipus can be drawn:[68] in the scorn shown for a wise adviser (Oedipus for Teiresias, Croesus for Solon), the attempt to avoid a prophesised fatal outcome (Oedipus leaving home, Croesus marrying off his son

[66] How and Wells (1912) 71 comment on the tragic irony of Adrastus' speech to Croesus when he agrees to go on the boar hunt to protect Atys because 'I ought to repay you for the favours which you have given me' (ὀφείλω γάρ σε ἀμείβεσθαι χρηστοῖσι – 1.42.2).

[67] For further discussion of this episode, see Asheri (2007) 104-7; Harrison (2000a) 40-1; also Chapter 5 where Solon's visit to Croesus is examined in the context of correct interpretations of *opsis*. For bibliography on the crossing of boundaries in Herodotus see n.136 and section 4.4 below for the idea that Xerxes' excessive desire to exercise *opsis* amounts to the crossing of such a boundary.

[68] As argued by Saïd (2002) 135.

and forbidding him from using weapons), while the determination of Atys to take part in the boar hunt which will directly lead to his death can be compared to the determination of Oedipus throughout Sophocles' play to find out the truth about the 'polluted thing' contaminating Thebes which is, of course, himself. Even the final words of the play as spoken by the chorus echo Solon's warning to Croesus: 'man must always look to his end, and no man can be called blessed until that day when he carries his happiness down to the end in peace' (ὥστε θνητὸν ὄντα κείνην τὴν τελευταίαν ἰδεῖν ἡμέραν ἐπισκοποῦντα μηδέν' ὀλβίζειν, πρὶν ἂν τέρμα τοῦ βίου περάσῃ μηδὲν ἀλγεινὸν παθών – 1528-30).[69]

Cyrus is another king who fatally misreads a significant dream. While sleeping, he sees an image of the young Darius with two wings, one spread over Asia and the other Europe (1.209.1).[70] Cyrus interprets this as proof that Darius is plotting against him; in fact, it merely foretells that one day Darius will sit on the Persian throne and that Cyrus' own death is near (though at the hands of the Massagetae, not Darius). One of the key points to note about this episode is the language of proof that Herodotus puts into Cyrus' mouth when explaining to Hystaspes why he can be so sure of Darius' treachery: ὡς δὲ ταῦτα ἀτρεκέως οἶδα, ἐγὼ σημανέω ('I know these things to be true, as I will demonstrate to you' – 1.209.3). He then goes on to describe his dream, referring to it as *opsis* throughout.

As discussed in Chapters 2 and 3, the audience is familiar with this phrase from the metanarrative: this is language Herodotus himself frequently uses when attempting to prove to his audience that a particular argument is correct, usually by reference to visual evidence. The difference here of course is that the evidence Cyrus is using (his dream) to support his argument (that Darius has rebelled) does not in fact provide reliable evidence at all, as Herodotus explicitly points out at 1.210.1.[71] This therefore raises interesting questions about the differences

[69] Compare Solon to Croesus: σκοπέειν δὲ χρὴ παντὸς χρήματος τὴν τελευτὴν κῇ ἀποβήσεται: πολλοῖσι γὰρ δὴ ὑποδέξας ὄλβον ὁ θεὸς προρρίζους ἀνέτρεψε (1.33); although Solon is more explicit in referring to divine agency here.

[70] Another motif familiar from Achaemenid iconography: see Asheri (2007) 215. For more on dreams in Near Eastern culture, see n.31 above.

[71] 'Cyrus' assumption in saying this was that Darius was conspiring against him, but in fact the gods were forewarning him of his own impending death there, and telling him that his kingdom would devolve onto Darius' (Κῦρος μὲν δοκέων οἱ Δαρεῖον ἐπιβουλεύειν ἔλεγε τάδε: τῷ δὲ ὁ δαίμων

between Herodotus' use of *opsis* as evidence versus that of the characters in the narrative, questions to which we will return in the next chapter. The irony here is further emphasised by the description of his dream as striking Cyrus as being of great importance (with the dream – *opsis* – the active force in the phrase: ὡς δέ οἱ ἐδόκεε μεγάλη εἶναι ἡ ὄψις – 1.209.3). It is indeed important, but not in the way in which Cyrus expects.

Hippias' dream provides us with a rather different kind of misinterpretation. He believes that his dream about sleeping with his mother foretells his successful return to Athens and that he will regain power. However, on landing with the Persians at Marathon, a sneezing fit causes one of his teeth to fall out into the sand whereupon he realises that this is in fact the fulfilment of the dream: 'this land is not ours. We will not conquer it. The only bit of it that belonged to me has been claimed by my tooth' (ἡ γῆ ἥδε οὐκ ἡμετέρη ἐστὶ οὐδέ μιν δυνησόμεθα ὑποχειρίην ποιήσασθαι: ὀκόσον δέ τί μοι μέρος μετῆν, ὁ ὀδὼν μετέχει – 6.107.4). Interestingly, in Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannos*, Jocasta mentions that men often dream about marrying their mothers (and thus Oedipus should not worry about the oracle that said he would kill his father and marry his mother).[72] Although this comment is clearly designed to increase the dramatic irony for the audience given the plot of the play, it may also indicate that dreams about marrying or sleeping with one's mother were a common or recognised type of dream.

Despite the fact that in the ancient world sneezing and losing teeth were regarded as ominous portents,[73] there is surely also an element of comedy here. Whereas other dreams in Herodotus foretell great events – the fall of empires, the defeat of armies, the death of royal heirs – this dream foretells the loss of a tooth (though that in itself may be a sign of Hippias' ultimate defeat). This episode perhaps also highlights Hippias' arrogance in thinking that he and his new Persian friends can

---

προέφαινε ὡς αὐτὸς μὲν τελευτήσειν αὐτοῦ ταύτῃ μέλλοι, ἡ δὲ βασιληίη αὐτοῦ περιχωρέοι ἐς Δαρεῖον).

[72] πολλοὶ γὰρ ἤδη κάν ὀνείρασιν βροτῶν μητρὶ ξυνηυνάσθησαν (981-2). Bowie (2009) 210 comments that there are strong parallels between *Oedipus Tyrannos* and the *Histories* given that the play's main theme is the fulfilment of a problematic oracle, refuting Jocasta's comments about the unreliability of oracles. One might compare the ways in which oracles are fulfilled in the *Histories* but not necessarily in the ways anticipated by their recipients.

[73] See further How and Wells (1912) 109, McQueen (2000) 193 and Scott (2005) 373.

defeat the Athenian army – one can imagine the derisive jeers from Herodotus' (Athenian) audience.[74] Perhaps the gods are teasing Hippias here too.

Stranger are the examples of Hipparchus and Polycrates who appear deliberately to ignore the ominous nature of their dreams (or in the case of Polycrates, that of his daughter). Polycrates' daughter sees him in a dream high up in the air being washed by Zeus and anointed by the sun. She realises that the dream is 'ominous', i.e., it has some prophetic value (although does not fully understand its significance) and implores her father not to go on his imminent trip to Magnesia to see the Persian governor Oroetes. Despite her pleas (and the warnings of both oracles and friends), Polycrates travels to Magnesia where Oroetes has him crucified, thus fulfilling the dream that he is out in the open being washed by the rain and dried out by the sun: 'her dream came true in all respects' says Herodotus (ἐπετέλεε πᾶσαν τὴν ὄψιν – 3.125.4). Saïd points out, however, that the fall of Polycrates does not follow the traditional tragic pattern, given that his murder by Oroetes seems unconnected with his crimes (killing one brother and expelling the other).[75]

Likewise Hipparchus sees a tall figure in a dream who warns him of his impending death; yet, despite recounting his dream to dream-interpreters, he then dismisses it and is murdered by Harmodius and Aristogiton at the Panathenaea procession later the same day (5.55-6). Interestingly, this is the only instance in the text of a Greek consulting dream-interpreters.[76] This may be reflective of the fact that interest in dream-interpretation as a discrete subject of enquiry appears to have been a somewhat later phenomenon (based on extant sources).

---

[74] See also Grottanelli's comment (1999) 148-9 about the irony of omens that come true while avoiding 'the wishful interpretations of ambitious men', a common theme in Herodotus which in this respect puts Hippias' dream on a par with those of e.g., Cyrus and Astyages. For more detailed commentary on this dream see Scott (2005) 372-4; Hornblower and Pelling (2017) 235-7.

[75] Saïd (2002) 125-6. But see also Kurke (1999) 113-21 who discuses the correspondence between this episode (given that Polycrates was lured to Magnesia by Oroetes' fake gold) and the story that Polycrates used counterfeit coins (lead coins covered in gold) to bribe the Spartans to leave Samos (*Histories*, 3.56).

[76] Possibly Herodotus is emphasising here Hipparchus' 'Eastern' nature due to his tyrannical behaviour and links to Persia (through his brother Hippias). How and Wells (1912) 25 argue that Herodotus' insistence on the reality of the dream and its communication to these dream-interpreters is evidence that the story was doubted.

Antiphon's work on the interpretation of dreams, written in the second half of the fifth century BC and known to us from fragments recorded by Cicero, was probably the first of its kind.[77] Flower argues that even this was not the formalisation of a systematic theory of dream-interpretation, but rather simply a collection of dreams with two different interpretations offered for each, including Antiphon's own (superior) interpretation (and in this sense it is arguably not unlike the approach found in Herodotus).[78] It may also be an indication that dream-interpreters were held in as little regard as *chresmologoi* appear to have been by some writers and therefore the association here with Hipparchus emphasises that he is a tyrant.[79]

In each episode, Herodotus gives us no indication of the protagonist's reaction on realising the true meaning of the dream at its fulfilment, in contrast with some of the other examples discussed above (such as Astyages and Cambyses). Does Polycrates' and Hipparchus' deliberate (wilful) blindness to the clear message of these dreams merely serve to underline the inescapability of their fate? But if so, this seems to undermine one of the (apparent) purposes of dreams in the text, to act as a warning to the recipients of future events.

4.2.4: Purpose and origin of dreams in the **Histories**

The sequence of dreams which appear to Xerxes and his uncle and adviser Artabanus (7.12-18) constitute the most complex dream episode in the text and throw up some important questions about the nature and purpose of dreams in the *Histories*. Just as Xerxes is about to set out on his vast military expedition against Greece, Artabanus persuades him to abort his plans and return home. But during the night, Xerxes is visited by a dream figure (with clearly divine attributes – tall, handsome, winged) who advises him to stick to his plans and invade Greece. Xerxes ignores the dream but the next night is visited by the same figure who

---

[77] Cicero, *De divinatione* 1.39, 2.144; also Diogenes of Oenoanda, fr. 24. See Pendrick (2002) 49-53 and 423-30 for background and commentary on the fragments.

[78] Flower (2008) 52-3, 125-6. Therefore Antiphon's book was 'not a manual for others to use, but an advertisement of the author's abilities'; he interpreted dreams in the manner of a traditional seer, not through a rationalising 'sophistic' lens.

[79] See Bowden (2003) 256-7 for negative attitudes towards *chresmologoi* found in Ancient Greek sources.

warns him again and threatens him with dire consequences (his fall from power) if he does not comply with the order to march against Greece.

When Xerxes discusses these dreams with Artabanus, the latter puts forward a rational explanation for dreams, arguing that they are not sent by the gods but are merely a manifestation of the worries and concerns that occupy our minds during the day. However, Artabanus agrees to test out his theory by dressing in Xerxes' clothes, sitting on his throne and sleeping in his bed; that night the dream figure appears to Artabanus, chastises him for persuading Xerxes to cancel the Greek expedition, and threatens to take out his eyes with red-hot skewers (loss of sight being a classic divine punishment – see section 4.4 below). Thus Artabanus' rational theory appears to have been disproved; Artabanus is persuaded that the gods are in fact encouraging the expedition and Xerxes continues to carry out his plans to invade Greece (which, as the audience knows, will result in the annihilation of his armies).

This episode has prompted some perplexity among scholars.[80] On first reading, these dreams seem to be a classic case of deception on the part of the gods: Xerxes is encouraged with dire warnings and threats to invade Greece, thus sealing his own downfall which is the very thing he is trying to avoid by obeying the dream figure's instructions. West, however, interprets the threats that Xerxes will be 'brought low' (ταπεινὸς – 7.14) if he does not follow the instructions, as genuine: she argues that it would have been a personal disaster for Xerxes if he had called off the expedition at that point – he had already made the case for war to his generals and would have suffered a serious loss of face if he had backed down (which could have led to revolts).[81]

Both Pelling and Harrison disagree: there is no evidence that Xerxes would have suffered the terrible consequences threatened by cancelling the expedition and in fact the Persians are delighted at his change of heart when he first tells them of his

[80] Scullion (2006) 197 has described the motivation of the deity behind these dreams as 'bafflingly opaque', but overall feels that the point here is to underline the Persian *nomos* of imperial expansion, so the question of whether the dreams are in fact deceptive is less relevant, which somewhat ducks the issue.

[81] West (1987) 264.

decision not to go (κεχαρηκότες – 7.13.3).[82] Furthermore, at this point Xerxes has not yet raised his great army and will spend the next four years doing so (7.20.1). Sabacos' dream is evidence that it is possible to ignore the message (in his case to cut in half all the priests in Egypt) without suffering negative consequences, and perhaps even manage to avoid those consequences (2.139).

However, this is not a classic case of misinterpretation of a dream such as with Croesus or Cyrus but rather a question of whether or not to believe the message given.[83] Certainly the figure is very convincing and clearly divine which makes Xerxes' deduction that the gods are behind his plans to invade Greece all the more understandable. Why does Herodotus introduce a rational explanation for dreams at this point only to discount it so completely? Harrison believes that this is done for the sole purpose of contradicting it (i.e., Herodotus is letting his audience know what he thinks of the theory) but does not rule out the possibility that he thought it could apply to some (perhaps more everyday) dreams.[84] Obviously the dreams Herodotus highlights in the text are only those which are particularly significant and important to the narrative; that does not mean he would have denied an explanation such as that put forward by Artabanus for the myriad of 'ordinary' dreams.

Harris suggests the appearance of the rationalist theory in the narrative is a nod from Herodotus towards a widespread contemporary view that a more rational explanation was suitable for those 'ordinary everyday dreams'.[85] Certainly the debate on whether dreams merely reflect the preoccupations of the dreamer and are therefore an extension of sense-perception, or can actually have some prophetic value as a form of divination, was current in Herodotus' day and continued throughout antiquity, with the Hippocratic writers and Aristotle taking

[82] Harrison (2000a) 136-7 and (2002) 559 – the dreams are clearly intended to deceive; Pelling (1991) 132.

[83] As Van Lieshout, for example, has recognised: (1970) 227-8. See also Harrison (2000a) 136.

[84] Harrison (2000a) 135.

[85] Harris (2009) 146: Herodotus references the rationalist theory in order not to be thought credulous as to the origins of dreams. Van Lieshout (1970) 246 also argues Herodotus believes in a rational explanation for some dreams.

the former view, while Artemidorus took the latter.[86] Perhaps, therefore, Herodotus is leaving the door open to this explanation of dream origins; the introduction and refutation of the theory at this point in the text serves a narrative purpose to underline to the audience the particular significance of this dream episode, knowing as they do that Xerxes' expedition is ultimately doomed.

Baragwanath introduces yet another consideration in analysing this episode. She suggests that there are clearly distinct Greek and Persian elements in the account of Xerxes' decision to invade Greece and that we are supposed to recognise the dream sequence as an 'Oriental motif' as indicated by the citation of a Persian source for the story about the dreams (ὡς λέγεται ὑπὸ Περσέων – 7.12.1). The purpose here is to show that Xerxes is not simply another autocratic leader driven by a hubristic desire for expansion to invade Greece resulting in his inevitable ruin (which would be the standard Greek interpretation of events) but his motives are more complex: he is bound by Persian customs and traditions (*nomoi*) as well as a pious desire to obey divine will.[87]

While he may be asking his audience to examine Xerxes' motives more closely, it is undeniable that for Herodotus as narrator these three dreams mark a crucial point in the story. Xerxes finally puts aside all doubts about the expedition and gathers 'by far the largest army we have ever known' (στόλων γὰρ τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν πολλῷ δὴ μέγιστος οὗτος ἐγένετο – 7.20.2) to march against Greece. This begins the final major episode and culmination of Herodotus' work, the great Persian invasion of Greece whose eventual defeat at the hands of the combined Greek forces constitutes the story which takes up the last three books of the *Histories* and

[86] A rational explanation for dreams can be found in Empedocles (DK 31B108) and some of the Hippocratic texts (see *On the Sacred Disease*, 17 (the brain as the cause of night visions) and *On Dreams* (or *Regimen IV*) – although here the author also admits to the existence of 'god-given' dreams which foretell the future (87)). See also Aristotle *On Dreams* and *On Divination in Sleep* which denies the existence of dreams sent by the gods. Harris-McCoy (2012) 444 suggests the *Histories* may have been a significant source of dreams for Artemidorus' *Oneirocritica*.

[87] See Baragwanath (2008) 251-3 for the full discussion. She continues her analysis of the Greek and Persian elements of Xerxes' motivation in her discussion of the building of the Athos canal (254-65).

contributes to the rise of Athens. Xerxes' momentous decision is therefore the hinge upon which the remaining books of the text rest.[88]

Knowing the outcome of this military campaign as they do, the whole episode contains an element of dramatic irony for Herodotus' audience and is therefore in keeping with the tragic nature and function of dreams in the text which we have observed previously. As Xerxes and Artabanus debate the meaning of these dreams and the course of action they should pursue, the audience knows that ultimately Xerxes will go on this expedition and thus seal his own fate. As Baragwanath points out, the irony is heightened by the fact that it is Artabanus, the man who advised against attacking Greece and originally opposed a divine explanation for Xerxes' dreams, who ends up adopting a literal reading of the dream messenger's words and persuading Xerxes to invade.[89] That Artabanus secretly continues to harbour doubts about the expedition (even though he is enthusiastically supporting it at 7.18.4), as we discover later when he is discussing its possible outcome with Xerxes again (7.47-52), underlines the tragedy.[90]

This element of the unheeded wise adviser is a constant theme throughout the *Histories* and once again familiar from Greek tragedy. According to Griffin, Xerxes' 'divine temptation, superhuman presumption and aspiration and eventual defeat and despair' is highly tragic (Aeschylean) in flavour, while the role of divine persuasion (whether through dreams or otherwise) in causing a protagonist to embark upon a destructive course of action and people forced to make impossible choices are common motifs from both Homer and tragedy and thus familiar to the audience.[91] Xerxes' later dream about wearing an olive wreath whose branches shadow the world but later disappear merely serves to confirm his conclusion that

---

[88] Harrison (2000a) 132 has also noted the programmatic function of this dream sequence in the text.

[89] Baragwanath (2008) 250.

[90] 'I pray that the final outcome of the dream is in accordance with what we both want. But it is true that I am still, even now, out of my mind with fear' (ὄψις μὲν ἡ ἐπιφανεῖσα τοῦ ὀνείρου, ὡς βουλόμεθα ἀμφότεροι, τελευτήσειε: ἐγὼ δ' ἔτι καὶ ἐς τόδε δείματος εἰμὶ ὑπόπλεος οὐδ' ἐντὸς ἐμεωυτοῦ – 7.47.2).

[91] Griffin (2006) 50, 52: Persuasion is the child of Ruin in Aeschylus' *Oresteia*; see also how Agamemnon is forced to decide whether or not to sacrifice his daughter Iphigenia (in Euripides' *Iphigenia in Aulis*) or Orestes to kill his mother Clytemnestra (in Sophocles' *Elektra*).

he is right to invade Greece. His self-delusion is thus complete – he does not even pause to consider the significance of the wreath's disappearance (and this is ignored by his dream interpreters – 7.19).[92] Xerxes has lost any ability to interpret *opsis*.

Dreams may be an 'instrument for communication between the divine and human realms'[93] but what is the purpose of sending dreams as warnings of the recipient's impending doom if those recipients either misinterpret the message (in the case of Croesus, Cyrus, Cambyses) or fail to recognise that it is a trick to persuade them to carry out certain actions which will lead to their downfall (as with Xerxes)?[94] Is it a cruel joke on the part of the gods, making the true realisation all the more terrible on fulfilment of the real meaning of the dream? Or perhaps the dream is not meant as a real warning at all but merely a method by which the gods ensure that the recipient in question seals his own fate?[95]

As Apollo points out to Croesus, he alone was responsible for interpreting the oracle that he would 'destroy a great empire' as referring to the Persian empire rather than his own and thus he has only himself to blame for his downfall at the

[92] How and Wells (1912) 132-3 comment that the dream is suspiciously Greek given the olive wreath and may well have occurred to an Athenian who had observed the change in Xerxes' fortunes after the capture of the Acropolis and the olive tree sacred to Athena. Certainly the olive seems more representative of the Greeks, and the Athenians in particular, than the Persians. Possibly this is also a subtle reference from Herodotus to the growing influence of Athens in his own day.

[93] Hollmann (2011) 92.

[94] This second kind of deceptive dream is familiar from Homer: see *Iliad*, 2.1-15 where Zeus sends 'evil dream' (οὖλον ὄνειρον – 2.6) to Agamemnon to tell him to attack the Trojans as he will win a great victory when actually this is a ploy to bring further destruction on the Achaeans (and Trojans).

[95] The episode of Aristodicus and the oracle at Branchidae is evidence that the gods are prepared to issue false instructions to destroy or punish the recipient. Aristodicus cannot believe that Apollo is instructing the Cymeans to surrender the suppliant Pactyes to the Persians. But the god explains that the purpose is 'to hasten the impiety and consequent destruction of Cyme' (ἵνα γε ἀσεβήσαντες θᾶσσον ἀπόλησθε – 1.159.4) presumably for the sacrilege of having asked the god whether to give up a suppliant in the first place. See Brown (1978) and Asheri (2007) 183 for further discussion of this episode. However, it is also worth pointing out with Harrison (2000a) 156-7 that the majority of dreams and other forms of divination may have been correctly interpreted; those mentioned by Herodotus are significant because of their misinterpretation and therefore the disastrous consequences which followed.

hands of Cyrus (1.91).[96] Even Croesus comes to realise that the fault was his and not the god's (συνέγνω ἐωυτοῦ εἶναι τὴν ἁμαρτάδα καὶ οὐ τοῦ θεοῦ – 1.91.6). The gods may misdirect and thus encourage a self-destructive course of action, but it is ultimately men who are the agents of that action. As discussed above (e.g., in relation to Astyages) it is the misinterpretation of the dream, i.e., human decision, which causes the dreamer to take the very action which will ensure the events the dream foretells/warns against are manifested.[97]

Once again there are strong links with the 'interplay of personal responsibility and divine compulsion' in Greek tragedy;[98] and in this there is an (arguably unresolved) tension which can be found throughout the *Histories* between man as an autonomous and free-willed agent and divine intervention in, and control of, human affairs. For although Croesus accepts personal responsibility for his own downfall, the Pythia also frames her account of events in terms of his downfall being inevitable due to the necessity that he pay for his ancestor Gyges' crime (1.91.1-2). Even Apollo could not delay this fate (μοῖρα) for longer than three years. So it seems that gods as well as men are constrained to act within a broader framework and in this context it is more understandable that humans should fail fully to comprehend the divine will.[99]

Pelling has characterised these two strands in Herodotean philosophy as showing humans both as passive beings (the gods destroying those who become too

[96] 'Because he misunderstood the statement and failed to follow it up with another enquiry, he should blame no one but himself for what happened' (οὐ συλλαβὼν δὲ τὸ ῥηθὲν οὐδ' ἐπανειρόμενος ἐωυτὸν αἴτιον ἀποφαινέτω – 1.91.4).

[97] This seems to point almost to a denial by the gods that they have a role to play in determining human fate; as Bowden (2005a) 69 has commented, 'divine involvement is hardly ever posited as an explanation for events ... it would be wrong, therefore, to characterise Herodotus as particularly "religious" in his historical approach'.

[98] Griffin (2006) 51. See also Harrison (2000a) 111-2, 124 who notes the question of shared responsibility for misfortune as between divine and human agency.

[99] See Harrison (2000a) 223-8 on the problems thrown up by this episode in the context of the (co-) operation of human and divine action in the *Histories*. Cf. Ellis' (2016) analysis of Xenophon's retelling of the Croesus story in the *Cyropaedia*, depicting Croesus only as to blame for his misfortune and denying a role for divine causation.

prosperous) and as active agents of their own destruction.[100] But he also combines the two by suggesting that divine envy of human prosperity prompts the gods to make men act in transgressive ways which in turn results in them bringing about their own downfall.[101] In this context the dream could be seen as one method by which the gods achieve this end. However, as Pelling also points out, any element of divine envy is distinctly absent from the Pythia's account of the reasons behind Croesus' fall at 1.91.[102]

It is undoubtedly the case that the way in which human and divine interact in the causation of events in the *Histories* is not straightforward. But it is not inconsistent to see the purpose of dreams within this patchwork as a method of ensuring that fate is fulfilled: the dream is sent to Xerxes when he is wavering over whether or not to invade Greece (in fact he has just decided *not* to go when the dream appears – 7.12.1);[103] Astyages' treatment of Harpagus incites him to encourage Cyrus to revolt against the king; the man whom Croesus sends on the boar hunt to protect his son is the one who kills him; Cambyses' murder of his brother Smerdis creates the power vacuum which gives the Magus Smerdis the opportunity to seize power – and all are acting to avoid the very same events foretold by their dreams. This is not to deny that fate is at least to some extent the result of human action, but as outlined above that action is taking place within a framework in which dreams may play a causative role.

Dreams also serve a key narrative purpose for Herodotus. One of the central themes of the *Histories* is the rise and fall of great empires and leaders (as indicated in the proem) and it is notable that most dreams are intimately

[100] There are plenty of references in the *Histories* to divine envy of humans – see, for example, Amasis' comments to Polycrates about divine jealousy of success (3.40.2) or Artabanus' warning to Xerxes about the gods' tendency to destroy prominent or superior things (7.10ε).

[101] Pelling (2006a) 148-50.

[102] Pelling (2006a) 162-4 argues that the more complex picture offered by Herodotus is designed to show his audience that questions of historical causation and explanation are challenging and to allow them to reach their own interpretations; it should not be seen as an inherent contradiction in the Herodotean world view.

[103] Grethlein (2009) 203 suggests that 'the intervention of the apparition alerts the reader to the reality that human beings remain subject to forces which are beyond their control'; see also Pelling (1991) 139-40 noting that 'the dream-sequence shows that ... [Artabanus'] advice [to cancel the invasion] *cannot* be taken'.

connected with the imminent decline or destruction of one great regime and the rise of another. Cyrus' dream about Darius presages his own death at the hands of the Massagetae and the eventual devolvement of the Persian throne to the Achaemenid line, just as Astyages' dream foretells the rise of Cyrus who will depose his grandfather. Hipparchus' dream warns him about the end of the tyrants' rule over Athens. And the death of Croesus' son as seen in his dream is a step on the path to the end of Mermnadae rule of Lydia (his heir and thus his line are annihilated given that his other son is incapacitated). In the narrative, the dream therefore acts as a signifier of imminent dynastic change and invariably the downfall of the dreamer.[104]

Usually these figures have also committed hubristic or sacrilegious acts which are linked to their eventual fall: Croesus in believing himself the most fortunate of all men in the face of Solon's clear demonstration to the contrary; Astyages by trying to murder his grandson; Cyrus in drugging and slaughtering the Massagetae; Cambyses by wounding the bull representing the Egyptian god Apis; Xerxes in believing he could subdue Greece – and all of them in thinking they could outwit fate. There is always a punishment for meddling with fate, such as Croesus' testing of all the different oracles to see which was the most accurate (1.46-9) or Aristodicus removing the sparrows from the temple at Branchidae to test the resolve of the god in telling him to deliver the suppliant Patyces to the Persians (1.159). But as in tragedy, the dream acts as an early warning (to the audience) that retribution is on its way.[105]

This analysis of the eighteen dreams in Herodotus has shown their important role in providing key markers of great events in the narrative and contribution to our understanding of *opsis* far outweighs their fleeting appearances. While Asheri may well be right that dreams are 'literary constructions which serve as a means of warning and foretelling the future',[106] those warnings are almost always ineffective

[104] For more on dreams as part of the language of signs used by Herodotus in the text, see Hollmann (2011) 76.

[105] See Mikalson (2002) 196: the misinterpretation of dreams and oracles by characters 'is one of Herodotus' favourite devices for foreshadowing and, in some instances, for explaining the suffering of his historical figures'.

[106] Asheri (2007) 105.

(and are designed to be). They are a clear sign to the audience that the dreamer is about to suffer a disastrous reversal of fortune, but he is left confused as to how to avert his fate.

In this regard, dreams are part of two broader themes in the *Histories*: the role of *opsis* in providing the trigger for, or playing the main part in, momentous events; and the misinterpretation of *opsis*, or the failure to harness it for personal gain, as a signifier of a protagonist's ultimate downfall.

4.3: The Role of *Opsis* in Key Events

The discussion so far has revealed that Herodotus often uses stories about *opsis* (in this case in dreams) as a marker of significant events in the text: the rise of Cyrus; the fall of Polycrates and of Samos to the Persians; Xerxes' great expedition against Greece. However, occasionally (apparently) minor incidents involving *opsis* are the trigger for momentous events. This is graphically demonstrated by the Gyges and Candaules incident at the beginning of the *Histories*.

King Candaules of Lydia is so enamoured of his wife that he wants his most trusted servant, Gyges, to see her naked so that he can fully appreciate her beauty, given that 'eyes are more trustworthy than ears' (ὦτα γὰρ τυγχάνει ἀνθρώποισι ἐόντα ἀπιστότερα ὀφθαλμῶν – 1.8.2). After some reluctance, Gyges conceals himself in the queen's bedroom and watches her undress – but she spots him as he then creeps from the room.

As punishment, Candaules' wife issues Gyges with an ultimatum: either he must kill Candaules and take the throne, or she will kill him. Gyges chooses the first option and kills his master (1.8-12). Thus what appears at first to be a fairly insignificant incident of watching a beautiful woman undress becomes the trigger for the fall of the Heraclidae dynasty in Lydia and the coming to power of Gyges' clan, the Mermnadae. But the story also reveals the power of *opsis*: seeing the king's wife naked breaches cultural and moral boundaries (as Herodotus

comments, in the non-Greek world it is shameful even for a man to be seen naked) so perhaps it is not surprising that the consequences are so dramatic.[107]

As Purves has noted, Candaules makes the mistake of confusing 'the categories of inside and outside, seen and unseen space'.[108] Further, as Pelling has pointed out, there is an irony in Candaules' maxim quoted above given that it is the queen's *opsis* when she spots Gyges leaving the room which provides the trigger for her ultimatum and the consequent regime change.[109]

Another good example of the use of *opsis* as a signifier is the behaviour of Hippocleides at the contest to win the hand of Cleisthenes' (tyrant of Sicyon) daughter Agariste (6.126-9). Hippocleides excels at all the different tests Cleisthenes sets the suitors and emerges as the clear favourite. However, on the day of the marriage ceremony he goes too far in the singing contest by dancing on a table, standing on his head and waving his legs in the air. Cleisthenes tells Hippocleides he has danced away his marriage, and it is the sight of Hippocleides behaving so ridiculously that convinces him not to choose him as son-in-law: ὡς δὲ εἶδε τοῖσι σκέλεσι χειρονομήσαντα, οὐκέτι κατέχειν δυνάμενος εἶπε ('but when he saw him waggling his legs around, he was unable to restrain himself and spoke' – 6.129.4) (emphasis added). So Agariste is married instead to the Alcmaeonid Megacles, thus giving the Alcmaeonidai a crucial boost on their way to power and dominance in Athens (as acknowledged by Herodotus – 6.126.1): a boyish incident

[107] For a detailed discussion of this episode see Asheri (2007) 81-4 and Purves (2014) 99-110 in the context of the viewing of interior space in Herodotus; for the possible influences on Herodotus' Gyges narrative, see Raubitschek (1955) and Bowie (1997) 41. Saïd (2002) 132-4 provides a good overview of the Gyges tradition. Branscome (2015) 254 notes that Candaules makes the 'fatal mistake of not considering his wife as a potential audience for the spectacle at all'; see also Dewald (1993) 61 noting Candaules' error of judgement in forgetting the multiple visual meanings of his wife's body. How and Wells (1912) 58 also comment that the only other story about Candaules (that he bought a picture by Bularchus of the *prolium Magnetum* – Pliny, *NH* XXXV 55) also involves 'aesthetic enthusiasm'. See also Harrison (1998b) 48-50 on the episode in the context of a comparison between the *Histories* and *The English Patient*.

[108] Purves (2010) 139. He also applies this to the Croesus and Solon episode: 'it is abundantly clear that Croesus prefigures his downfall by opening the doors to his treasure-house and making its contents visible'.

[109] Pelling (2006a) 144-5.

of drunken revelry observed by Cleisthenes becomes a key turning point in the rise of this powerful family.[110]

In a similar episode, Syloson, the brother of Polycrates, is able to reclaim Samos from Darius as a result of a previous chance encounter. Years earlier, when Darius was just a member of Cambyses' personal guard, he spotted (ἰδὼν) Syloson in the streets of Memphis wearing a beautiful red cloak. Syloson gave the cloak to Darius as a present, later claiming Samos as his reward when Darius becomes Persian king (3.139).[111]

Herodotus is also able to see the humorous side of these episodes, as exemplified by the story of how the Alcmaeonidai acquired their great wealth (6.125). On a visit to Sardis, Alcmaeon is invited by Croesus to take from the royal treasury as much gold as he can carry on his person in one visit. Alcmaeon wears a huge tunic with a big fold and enormous boots so he is able to pack himself round with gold, even filling his mouth with treasure. As he staggers out of the treasury, the sight of him amuses Croesus so much (ἰδόντα δὲ τὸν Κροῖσον γέλως ἐσῆλθε – 6.125.5) that he gives Alcmaeon twice as much gold again, thus founding the Alcmaeonidai family fortunes.[112] Apocryphal the story may be, but there is surely an element of comedy here, the audience laughing with Croesus at how such absurd (yet crafty – and Athenian?) behaviour could produce so great a reward.[113]

---

[110] For detailed commentary on the episode, see Thomas (1989) 268-70, 272; Scott (2005) 417-29; Hornblower and Pelling (2017) 275-85.

[111] See Harrison (2003a) 244-6 for discussion of this episode as evidence that Herodotus recognised the ultimate significance of seemingly insignificant events and the hand of the divine in the original encounter between Syloson and Darius.

[112] The story also provides an interesting counterpoint to the reaction of another Athenian visitor to Croesus' treasury – Solon (1.29-33). Whereas Solon is unmoved by the mounds of gold, recognising that wealth is not a guarantee of happiness or long-term prosperity, Alcmaeon is willing to appreciate its worldly benefits. Yet both are vindicated in their own ways: Solon by being one of the most respected wise men in Greek culture – ultimately even by Croesus; Alcmaeon by utilising his new wealth to found a powerful dynasty.

[113] For a discussion of the historicity of this episode and possible links between the Alcmaeonidai and Lydia, see Scott (2005) 414-17. See also Thomas (1989) 266-8, 272 for a discussion of the role of the story in the portrayal of the Alcmaeonidai in both the *Histories* and more broadly in fifth-century BC Athens. In her view, the story is told against Alcmaeon (exemplifying his greed, links with the East and tyranny) suggesting a popular provenance for the story rather than a family tradition; cf. Hornblower and Pelling (2017) 271-4 who emphasise the comic tone and note Alcmaeon's cunning may well have met with Greek approval. See Munson (2001) 260-4 for the

Although some of these stories may seem rather far-fetched, by telling them in this way with a key moment of *opsis* providing the trigger for significant events, Herodotus is perhaps attempting to demonstrate the power of *opsis* to prompt people to act in certain ways and its role in the causation of events, yet in a way in which the protagonists do not appreciate. This could be seen as part of the broader theme in the *Histories* of showing how 'small things become big' (and big things become small), i.e., one cannot always anticipate who will ultimately be the victors and losers of history, just as Solon tried to explain to Croesus.[114]

This influential role played by *opsis* as the underlying cause of great events in part explains the value placed on visual proof by characters in the narrative (this will be explored in Chapter 5). Yet it also highlights the dangers of relying on the *opsis* of others for evidence, as exemplified by characters such as Harpagus and Polycrates. Harpagus is entrusted by Astyages with the task of killing the infant Cyrus after Astyages' dreams foretell that Cyrus will one day rule in his place. However, not wanting the child's blood on his hands, Harpagus in turn entrusts the task to Mitradates, one of Astyages' herdsmen. Mitradates and his wife decide to keep and bring up Cyrus and expose on the mountain in his place their own infant son who was stillborn (1.108-112).

Crucially, rather than going to check himself, Harpagus then sends his personal guards to inspect and bury the child's body: εἶδέ τε διὰ τούτων καὶ ἔθαψε τοῦ βουκόλου τὸ παιδίον (lit: '[Harpagus] saw and buried the herdsman's child through them / through their agency' 1.113.3). That phrase – εἶδέ τε διὰ τούτων – brilliantly captures the point here: Harpagus does not look for himself (autopsy), but relies on the *opsis* / 'sees' through the eyes of others.[115] Thus he fails to detect

episode in the context of Herodotus' relationship with the Alcmaeonidai and a comparison with the meeting between Croesus and Solon in Book 1.

[114] See 1.5.4 where Herodotus explains that small cities become big, and big become small (τὰ γὰρ τὸ πάλαι μεγάλα ἦν, τὰ πολλὰ αὐτῶν σμικρὰ γέγονε, τὰ δὲ ἐπ' ἐμεῦ ἦν μεγάλα, πρότερον ἦν σμικρά) – human happiness never staying in one place for long.

[115] Most translations fail to capture this nuance, choosing to put the guards in the active position, e.g., 'the guards carried out an inspection on [Harpagus'] behalf'. The phrase occurs again at 1.117.5 (εἶδον δι' ἐκείνων) when Harpagus is explaining his actions to Astyages.

that Mitradates has switched the children, something he might have spotted given that he knew Cyrus.[116]

Ironically, *opsis* also plays an important role in Astyages' revenge against Harpagus when the mistake is uncovered. He has Harpagus' own son killed and served up at a feast where Harpagus is fed his own son's flesh. Harpagus is unaware of what he is eating until at the end of the meal Astyages has the boy's head, hands and feet brought in on a covered platter. On being encouraged to lift the cover, Harpagus sees his son's remains (ὀρᾷ τοῦ παιδὸς τὰ λείμματα; ἰδὼν... – 1.119.6) and realises what has happened. So Harpagus' punishment for relying on others' *opsis* involves him being forced to use his own *opsis* in a horrific way.

Similarly, as discussed above, Polycrates relies on the *opsis* of his secretary Maeandrius with disastrous results. Maeandrius is sent to inspect the chests of gold which Oroetes is to provide for Polycrates, not realising that only the top layer is gold and the rest stones. It is this report of gold which lures Polycrates to Persia where he is killed by Oroetes (3.123-5). However, in this case it is less clear that had Polycrates gone to inspect the gold for himself he would have detected the deception or that he would not have been killed anyway. Rather the episode serves as another motif (the failure to invoke autopsy at a key moment) to signify Polycrates' imminent demise.

4.4: The Abuse and Misuse of *Opsis*

We have just seen how relying on others' *opsis*, i.e., not seeing for oneself, can be a very costly mistake. However, Herodotus is also keen to use his narrative to highlight that there is equally a danger in seeing *too much* for oneself, of giving way to an all-consuming desire to see. We have already observed how Candaules' insistence that Gyges break a cultural and societal taboo (to do something ἄνομον as Gyges puts it, with all the significant connotations of boundary crossing that

[116] It is worth noting here that the idea of trusted servants or subordinates being a king's/leader's 'eyes and ears' is common to Median/Persian culture. Indeed, Cyrus is found as a boy of ten years of age playing at being king with a group of friends, one of whom has been made the 'King's Eye' (chief spy) (1.114). See Asheri (2007) 160 for further detail on this.

word holds) and enter his bedroom to look at the queen naked brings about his own downfall.[117]

Therefore Candaules is punished when he is murdered by Gyges (significantly, Gyges attacks him from the same spot where he had hidden to watch Candaules' wife – κατακρύπτει ὑπὸ τὴν αὐτὴν θύρην – 1.12.1) even though it is Gyges who commits the actual act of seeing too much. Yet Gyges' offence of giving in to his master's command will not leave his family unscathed: his descendant Croesus' defeat by Cyrus many years later is, at least in part, punishment for Gyges' crime, as Apollo explains (1.91.1).[118]

The Greek word used by Herodotus for Candaules' love for his wife which prompts this destructive series of events is ἔραμαι (ἠράσθη – 1.8.1) which, with its link to ἔρως, refers to a passionate desire or longing rather than marital love, perhaps a surprising word in this context.[119] As Davis points out, the noun ἔρως occurs three times in the *Histories* and the verb ἐράω eight times; seven of these eleven occurrences (in addition to the two Candaules references) refer to illicit types of love such as Cambyses' love for his sister (3.31), Mycerinus' love for his daughter (2.121.1) or Xerxes' love for his brother's wife and then his niece (9.108) while the other two refer to a love of tyranny: Polycrates' daughter's reference to the 'lovers' (ἐρασταί) of tyranny (3.53.3) and Pausanias' desire to become tyrant of Greece (5.32).[120]

---

[117] Purves (2014) 97 notes that 'the outsider's act of looking within the room is repeatedly equated with desire' in the *Histories*.

[118] Branscome (2015) 252-5 notes that there are several similarities between the story of Candaules and Gyges and that of the latter's descendant Croesus' encounter with Solon. For example, both Candaules and Croesus organise visual spectacles which fail to impress their intended audiences in the way anticipated – and this in turn provides a sign to the audience that Croesus' attempt to impress Solon will fail.

[119] For an exploration of ἔρως in Greek literature, philosophy and culture, see Calame (1999), Sanders (2013) and Sanders et al. (2013).

[120] See Davis (2000) 641ff and (2011) 146-9 for a discussion of the link between ἔρως and tyranny in the *Histories* and its *antinomion* nature; Davis argues that Candaules' determination that Gyges should affirm his wife's beauty is in effect a metaphor for his tyrannical desire to impose his rule on the whole world: 'a desire that there be no distinction between his experience of the world and the world ... a desire to remake the world in his own image'. In this context Candaules' love for his wife can be seen as a dangerous desire which causes him and Gyges to breach both a cultural law (*nomos*) and an '*opsis* boundary' (see further below). See also Pelling (1997a) 56 on this

In particular, Xerxes' love for his sister-in-law (unnamed) and niece (Artaynte) in Book 9 provides an element of ring composition with the Gyges and Candaules episode in Book 1, although this time the regime change which is nearly brought about by Xerxes' brother Masistes is prevented.[121] Masistes intends to incite a revolt in Bactria in revenge for his wife's mutilation by Xerxes' wife Amestris, but he, his sons and troops are intercepted and killed by Xerxes' forces (9.113). Nevertheless, the destructive consequences of ἔρως are once again in evidence.[122]

Indeed, this is a common theme in much of Greek literature where ἔρως is encountered.[123] One might note the desire (ἔρως) of the Athenians for the Sicilian expedition in Book 6 of Thucydides' *Peloponnesian War* which led to such disastrous consequences when all members of the expeditionary force (including the great general Nikias) are eventually killed or captured, precipitating Athens' ultimate defeat. Here the active force of ἔρως (lit: 'a passionate desire to sail seized them' – καὶ ἔρως ἐνέπεσε τοῖς πᾶσιν ὁμοίως ἐκπλεῦσαι – 6.24.3) makes the episode all the more dramatic and underlines the force of the emotion.[124] Plutarch later picks up on this language in his *Life of Alcibiades* in describing how Alcibiades fanned the flames of the Athenian desire (ἔρως) for the expedition.[125] Hornblower notes the link made by scholars between this passage and Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* where Klytemnestra speaks of her fear of ἔρως taking over the army 'to ravish

---

'transgressive ἔρως' in his discussion of the boundaries between Greek and barbarian and Konstan (1983) 12-13 on the inherently transgressive nature of ἔρως in Greek thought. See Hornblower (2013) 133 on the forward-looking reference to Pausanias' ambitions at 5.32.

[121] On this ring composition see Griffiths (1999) 181: he argues that one of the effects of the device is to '[enforce] the thought that oriental monarchy is doomed to repeat its mistakes'. See also Welser (2009) 361-2 who draws out the parallels in detail.

[122] As Harrison (2003b) 149 points out, Xerxes' illicit love is the motive which supposedly 'leads to the collapse ... of the Persian court into a fatal degeneracy'.

[123] Pelling (2006a) 142 n.5 points out that another word for desire (ἵμερος) occurs in similar contexts in the *Histories*, often used to introduce a tyrannical theme. See also Branscome (2015) 243 on the negative connotations of ἵμερος in the *Histories*, in particular in the context of the meeting of Croesus and Solon.

[124] Thucydides' account of this episode is also important for the arguably negative light it places on θεωρία (the longing for which is the partial cause of the younger men's enthusiasm for the expedition – 6.24.3) in contrast with its characterisation in Herodotus.

[125] Plutarch, *Alcibiades*, 17.2: ὁ δὲ παντάπασι τὸν ἔρωτα τοῦτον ἀναφλέξας αὑτῶν.

what they ought not, overcome by desire of gain' (ἔρως δὲ μή τις πρότερον ἐμπίπτῃ στρατῷ πορθεῖν ἃ μὴ χρή, κέρδεσιν νικωμένους – 341-2).[126]

The destructive nature of ἔρως is familiar from Greek tragedy, perhaps most famously in Sophocles' *Antigone* where the chorus sing a hymn which addresses ἔρως directly, commenting on its invincible power which conquers mortal and god alike, makes men mad, and is capable of misleading even righteous men's minds into being unrighteous, to their ruin, being the direct cause of Haimon's quarrel with his father Kreon (ἔρως ... ὁ δ' ἔχων μέμηνεν ... – *Antigone*, 781-800). The chorus in Euripides' *Hippolytus* (521-64) has a similar hymn commenting on Phaedra's secret desire for her stepson where ἔρως is called 'the despot of mankind' (τὸν τύραννον ἀνδρῶν – 538).[127] Herodotus' references to the destructive power of ἔρως and by analogy his emphasis on the dangers of certain desires in relation to *opsis* (see discussion below) are therefore part of a broader pattern in Greek literature of highlighting the pitfalls of this kind of passionate, excessive desire.

If Candaules is the first ruler in the text whose desires in relation to *opsis* bring about his downfall, then Xerxes is the last, also providing an element of ring composition to this theme.[128] Indeed, from Book 7 to the end of the work, Xerxes is portrayed as a man who is obsessed with 'seeing things'.[129] When moving his great army towards the Asia Minor coast on their way to Greece, Xerxes decides to stop off to view Troy and the famous sites of the Trojan War (ἀνέβη ἴμερον ἔχων

---

[126] Hornblower (2008) 36 addresses more generally the poetic nature of this expression and also the link back to *Peloponnesian War*, 6.13.1 where Nikias speaks of the 'desperate desire for things beyond your reach' (δυσέρωτας εἶναι τῶν ἀπόντων) which has taken hold of the Athenian troops.

[127] For discussion of ἔρως in Greek tragedy and its links with madness and death or destruction, see Thumiger (2013): 'While others [emotions] are granted a variety of nuances and outcomes, sexual passion is remarkable for being univocally associated with instances of loss of self, destructiveness and disorder, and systematically implicated with madness' (28). She notes that in tragedy, ἔρως normally denotes a deviant (and usually female) form of love; the choice of the word to describe Candaules' feelings for his wife is therefore all the more striking.

[128] Lovatt (2013) 19 also notes the connection between *opsis* and ἔρως, the wound of love (a classic topos) being imagined as inflicted by the beloved's gaze.

[129] As noted by Konstan (1987) 63 following Immerwahr (1966) 182; Konstan comments (68) that a passion for viewing things is specific to Asian kings; see also Steiner (1994) 143-6 and Demont (2009) 201 noting that the desire to see 'characterises Xerxes more than any other actor' in the *Histories*.

θεήσασθαι – 7.43.1), with the irony presumably not lost on Herodotus' audience that Troy is another example of a great Eastern power brought low by the Greeks.[130]

Shortly afterwards at Abydus (7.44-5), he wants to see and survey his whole army and fleet (ἠθέλησε ... ἰδέσθαι πάντα τὸν στρατόν – 7.44) so has a special viewing point set up on a hill overlooking the shore which in turn leads to another desire to see the ships race (θηεύμενος δὲ ἰμέρθη τῶν νεῶν ἄμιλλαν γινομένην ἰδέσθαι – 7.44). We are told that Xerxes took great pleasure in watching the race and surveying the army and congratulated himself (ἥσθη ... ἐωυτὸν ἐμακάρισε – 7.44-5) – a clear sign of hubristic tendencies, as is further shown by his outrage at Artabanus' suggestion that the great forces arrayed below them might not be sufficient to defeat the Greeks (7.48). Grethlein suggests that Xerxes' viewpoint, high above his army, implies a detachment from the action which underlines the king's disconnection from reality. It also represents a desire to create and fix a historical narrative from present events, emphasised by the juxtaposition with the visit to Troy (i.e., the viewing of historical events).[131]

Once his men have crossed the Hellespont, Xerxes has the army organised into units and decides to ride through them all to view them yet again (ἐπεθύμησε αὐτός σφεας διεξελάσας θεήσασθαι – 7.100.1). Xerxes' urge to see things, inspecting his troops or sightseeing at famous locations on his journey into Greece, borders on obsession and it is noticeable that on each occasion Herodotus links words for seeing with those for desire, as highlighted above, almost to an absurd degree – for example, in his description of Xerxes' determination to see the mouth of the river Peneius: ἐπεθύμησε ... θεήσασθαι ... ὡς δὲ ἐπεθύμησε, καὶ ἐποίεε ταῦτα

[130] In this Xerxes is also following in the footsteps of Darius (see 4.85-8) who stops off to sightsee at the Euxine Sea and the Bosporus on his expedition to Scythia (which also ended in failure). Significantly, this sightseeing occurs immediately before Darius crosses into Europe using the pontoon bridge he has built over the Bosporus (4.89.1) just as Xerxes visits Troy before crossing his bridge over the Hellespont into Europe (7.55). Clearly Herodotus intends a direct parallel to be drawn here: for comparisons between the two expeditions, see Hartog (1988); for these episodes as examples of Persian imperialism providing the framework for geographical material in the *Histories*, see Harrison (2007b) 55.

[131] Grethlein (2009) 209-11 and (2013) 193-5: 'Xerxes' gaze is carried by the desire to freeze the present, give it the final status of the past and thus deprive it of all the insecurity that threatens human life' (194).

... ἐπεὶ δὲ ἀπίκετο καὶ ἐθεήσατο Ξέρξης τὴν ἐκβολὴν τοῦ Πηνειοῦ, ἐν θώματι μεγάλῳ ἐνέσχετο ('this made him want to see it ... having conceived this desire he acted upon it ... once Xerxes arrived and saw the mouth of the Peneius he was astonished at what he saw' – 7.128).[132]

We are reminded of Artabanus' comments during Xerxes' dream episode (discussed above) where he warns against the dangers of 'excessive desire' (ἐπιστάμενος ὡς κακὸν εἴη τὸ πολλῶν ἐπιθυμέειν – 7.18.2). He recalls the ill-fated campaigns of Cyrus against the Massagetae, Cambyses against the Ethiopians and Darius against the Scythians, kings whose thirst for greater power and glory was their downfall. The irony here is that in the face of these obviously valid arguments, the dreams have convinced Artabanus that Xerxes should still invade Greece.[133] Indeed, the personal desires of Xerxes are a motif of his expedition against Greece from the outset, when he calls his council of advisers together to 'declare before all what he desired' (αὐτὸς ἐν πᾶσι εἴπῃ τὰ θέλει – 7.8.1), the personal ambitions of tyrants being a key part of their characterisations in the *Histories*.[134]

This is clearly Herodotus speaking here: one of the key lessons of the *Histories* is that those who overreach themselves, whether in deed, in trying to expand their empires too far, or in thought, such as Croesus believing himself to be the happiest man alive, are ultimately doomed to fail and will be punished for those desires.[135] Xerxes' narrative in Books 7-9, being the culmination of this great history of the Persian Wars and the Greek relationship with the East, personifies this

[132] This curiosity on the part of Xerxes (and Darius) has been noted by Harrison (2003b) 148 who points out that this kind of desire for observation is not innocent but linked to imperial conquest, as is the desire to set up physical memorials of such conquests. Branscome (2013) 215-6 also notes Xerxes' particular obsession with gazing at his possessions. De Bakker (2016) 97-8 comments that Xerxes' frequent panoptic viewpoints do not guarantee him success in battle or understanding of his situation.

[133] Although Artabanus still has his doubts as we discover at 7.47 (discussed above).

[134] See Baragwanath (2008) 243.

[135] In this context, one can also note the way in which the *Histories* highlight the dangers of wishing to acquire knowledge for the wrong reasons; for example, Cambyses' desire to know more about the Ethiopians by sending his envoys (in reality spies) to offer them gifts is in fact a pretext for his imperialist ambitions (3.17): see Irwin (2014) 29.

phenomenon, his excessive desire to see mirroring his dangerous ambition to subdue Greece which brings about his downfall.

This motif also exemplifies the dangers of breaching boundaries whether those be physical (Croesus' diversion of the River Halys round his army by digging a new river bed – 1.75);[136] cultural / social (Gyges and Cambyses' treatment of his wife (see further above), Cyrus' slaughter of the sleeping Massagetae – 1.211-14); or religious (Cambyses' disrespect for the Egyptian god Apis – 3.27-9, Anacharsis' adoption of 'foreign' (i.e., Greek) religious practices – 4.76[137]). Divine retribution (whether direct or through the agency of man) operates to punish any transgression of these boundaries and bring the culprit back into line.[138]

To this list can now be added a hitherto unrecognised type, defined here as the '*opsis* boundary', the breach of which is linked to the viewer's ultimate ruin, ironically often because of the value that is placed by characters in the narrative on seeing for oneself. One might conclude that this analysis is problematic for Herodotus as an investigator given that he places such importance on *opsis* as a key source in the metanarrative. However, as we will explore at the end of Chapter

[136] Crossing natural boundaries (usually water) between two countries or continents is always a transgression in the *Histories* which is ultimately punished as it breaches the limits set by gods on men: see also Cyrus crossing the Araxes, Darius crossing the Danube, Xerxes crossing the Hellespont and Mardonius crossing the Asopus. See, in particular, Immerwahr (1966) 293, further commented on by Bowie (2012) 274-5, who points out the Homeric echoes here. See also Lateiner (1989) 127-35, Baragwanath (2008) 262 and Irwin (2014) 27 on Cambyses' desire to conquer the Ethiopians as symptomatic of a ruler overreaching himself leading to inevitable ruin. For the crossing of other kinds of boundaries (cultural and social, but particularly those between Greeks and barbarians) see Pelling (1997a).

[137] Anacharsis was a Scythian 'wise man' who travelled extensively and thus was known for his great wisdom. However, he went too far in practising (in secret) the religious rites of the goddess Cybele and the Scythian king killed him on observing him partaking in these rites. This episode illustrates the dangers of breaching both religious and cultural boundaries: 'that is what interest in foreign practices and contact with the Greeks brought him' comments Herodotus (4.77.2). Corcella (2007) 636 notes that there is perhaps a polemical aspect to this story in Herodotus' representation of the cult of Cybele (usually viewed by the Greeks as exotic and foreign) as Greek. Pelling (1997a) 54 also highlights the 'internal Otherness' of Anacharsis. For a detailed account of the history of Anacharsis, see Kindstrand (1981).

[138] See Harrison (2000a) 111-12 for the operation of divine retribution through or alongside human agency, (2007a) 376-9 exploring common themes of divine retribution in Greek literature and (2015b) 26 on the way in which divine retribution often seems to match the punishment to the crime.

5, Herodotus may be using these narratives as cautionary tales for his audience on how not to abuse *opsis*.

Therefore, it is no surprise to find that it is the same (or similar) characters in the text who try and fail to use *opsis* to their advantage and/or fail to interpret correctly the evidence provided by *opsis*. The best example of this is Xerxes whose attempts at visual deceptions are, in Herodotus' words, 'risible' (γελοῖον – 8.25.2). After the battle of Thermopylae where the Persian army defeated the famous 300 Spartans but at the cost of 20,000 of their own men, Xerxes attempts to make his victory look far more glorious by burying his fallen soldiers in mass graves covered with leaves and leaving only 1,000 corpses on the battlefield.[139] He then invites the Persian fleet to view the battlefield so they can see for themselves the folly of those who oppose Xerxes' army (i.e., comparing the 1,000 dead of Xerxes with the 4,000 corpses of the Greeks, the Spartans having been supported by some Thespians and helots, as Herodotus explains).[140]

However, despite the great desire for sightseeing among the members of the Persian fleet (perhaps mirroring Xerxes' own thirst for seeing), none of them are taken in by Xerxes' attempt at propaganda (ού μὲν ούδ' ἐλάνθανε τοὺς διαβεβηκότας Ξέρξης ταῦτα πρήξας περὶ τοὺς νεκροὺς τοὺς ἐωυτοῦ – 'Xerxes did not in any way manage to deceive those who had come over with the device concerning the bodies of his men' – 8.25.2). The use of the double negative here (ού μὲν ούδ') emphasises the total failure of his designs and, as Branscome has persuasively argued, provides a contrast with the previous point made by Herodotus at 8.25.1, that the men were convinced that the Greek corpses they saw were of Spartans and Thespians when in fact they also included helots. Thus Xerxes entirely unintentionally deceives his men as to the nationality of the Greek

[139] For extensive discussion of this episode, see Branscome (2013) 192-224. As part of his overall thesis that Herodotus sets up rival enquirers throughout the narrative in order to critique their methods and promote his own, Branscome sees Herodotus' motives here as demonstrating to his audience that Xerxes' version of the Thermopylae narrative is false (193, 211). See also Arrington (2015) 25 in the context of the contrasting attitudes of Greeks and Persians to the treatment of the war dead.

[140] Although the Persians do not realise that most of the dead are helots and think all the Greek dead are Spartans and Thespians (8.25.1). For recent bibliography on Thermopylae, see Matthews (2006) and Cartledge (2007) and (2013).

corpses – this serves to underline yet further the total failure of his actual objective, to induce his men into believing that far fewer Persians died at Thermopylae than was in fact the case. The οὐ μὲν οὐδ' at 8.25.2 thus takes on a distinctly ironic flavour.[141]

Herodotus' scorn at Xerxes' attempt to deceive his soldiers is particularly striking: καὶ γὰρ δὴ καὶ γελοῖον ἦν – 'for in fact it was completely risible' – 8.25.2). The forcefulness of the καὶ γὰρ δὴ καὶ denies any other view of the matter, while the use of laughter is surely designed to be especially crushing. Branscome sees a strong polemical aspect to Herodotus' laughter here, noting the only other time Herodotus 'laughs' in the text (at 4.36.2) is in a polemical context; as a rival storyteller of the Thermopylae narrative, Xerxes is completely discredited.[142] It is also noteworthy that this is the only visual deception in the *Histories* which does fail, thereby underlining Xerxes' position as the character most incapable in terms of his relationship with *opsis*.[143]

This episode therefore shows that Xerxes is unable to use *opsis* to deceive his own men, let alone the Greeks. Indeed, on capturing some Greek spies who have come to view his army, he has them taken on a tour around the whole camp to 'feast their eyes' (ταῦτα θηεύμενοι ἔωσι πλήρεες – 7.146.3) and to impress upon them the great size of the army in the hope that when they report back this will terrify the Greeks into deciding against making a stand against the Persians (7.146-7). Naturally this has only the opposite effect (we assume) of uniting the Greeks against the Persian threat (as was indeed the intention of the Greeks in the first place in sending the spies to report back). Yet when Xerxes spots grain ships in the Hellespont heading for Greece, he refuses to let his men block them; so confident is he that he will defeat the Greeks he believes the supplies will eventually be his anyway, another display of his dangerous arrogance (7.147.2-3).

---

[141] See Branscome (2013) 206-8 for discussion on the various possible interpretations of this phrase.

[142] Branscome (2013) 211-12. At 4.36.2, Herodotus is criticising contemporary map-makers' views of world geography. There may be further irony in the use of laughter here given that earlier Xerxes had laughed at the Spartan custom of combing their hair before battle (7.209.1 – see later in this chapter).

[143] See further Chapter 5 for visual deceptions. See Grethlein (2013) 197 on this passage and also (2009) 213 in the context of Xerxes' failure to create a historical narrative.

These incidents also reveal Xerxes' complete inability to understand the Greek mentality and culture. As further exemplified by his reaction to Demaratus' explanation of the Spartans' custom of combing their hair (observed by the Persian spies at Thermopylae) as being a clear sign they are preparing for war – he finds it 'risible' (γελοῖα) and 'unbelievable' (ἄπιστα) (7.208-9) – Xerxes' failure to recognise the Greek determination to defend their land and culture at all costs is a large part of the cause of his ultimate defeat.[144] And as we know from the *Histories*, failure to understand the culture of the people you are hoping to conquer is usually a recipe for disaster.

The many stories involving Xerxes and *opsis* culminate in the battle of Salamis where Herodotus makes much of the fact that Xerxes is watching the battle (8.69, 8.88, 8.90) believing that his presence will spur the men on to fight better than they had at Euboea where he had not been present (8.69.2).[145] The Persians do indeed fight more courageously, each feeling that their King is watching him, but even so they are no match for the superior Greek discipline and tactics (8.86). Herodotus' comment that they were spurred on by fear of Xerxes (δειμαίνων) is perhaps significant here given his earlier remarks about the Athenians fighting better under a democracy than a tyranny because every man was fighting as a free man for himself rather than for a master (5.78). Thus at least in part the Persian War becomes a battle between different political ideals.[146]

Two further examples serve to illustrate the inability of flawed characters to interpret *opsis* correctly. Just before the battle of Plataea, Mardonius (the Persian commander left in charge by Xerxes of the Persian forces in Greece after the battle of Salamis) and his army see that the Greek positions are deserted (οἰ πάντες ὀρῶμεν διαδράντας); he assumes that they have been intimidated by the constant attacks of the Persian cavalry and have run away through cowardice – he crows

[144] See Boedeker (1987) for discussion of Demaratus' character and his role in the text.

[145] Just as Xerxes watched (θηεύμενον) the battle of Thermopylae, leaping from his seat three times in fear for the safety of his troops (7.212.1).

[146] There is some irony in the fact that Athens will itself become the 'tyrant state' later in the fifth century BC in her efforts to take control of the whole of Greece, culminating in the Peloponnesian War against Sparta. For discussion of Herodotus' attitudes to Athens and growing Athenian imperialism, see Chapter 5.

over the Greek (and particularly Spartan) 'nobodies' (οὐδένες...) and the supremacy of the Persian forces (9.58).

In fact, the Spartans and Tegeans have only retreated to take up stronger positions outside Plataea from where they will win a glorious victory over the Persians in which Mardonius is killed (9.63-4). The commander is too quick to reach a conclusion based on the evidence of *opsis* – or rather he uses *opsis* to support a judgement he has already made (that Persian outstrips Greek military prowess) as is shown by his surprise that his fellow Persian Artabazus had been afraid of the Greek forces (9.58.3).[147] Here Herodotus highlights the dangers of using *opsis* to form judgements too easily and Mardonius' mistake heralds his imminent demise.

As was discussed in the analysis of dreams, Croesus is another figure who struggles with the interpretation of visual evidence until it is too late. Before the fall of Sardis to Cyrus' forces, Croesus observes that the outskirts of the city are infested with snakes but that the horses in the fields are eating them, clearly an omen (ἰδόντι δὲ τοῦτο Κροίσῳ ... ἔδοξε τέρας εἶναι – 1.78.1). As he does not understand the meaning of the omen he asks the shrine at Telmessus which decodes the meaning – a foreign army (the horses) will invade and subdue the local inhabitants (the snakes) – but the answer comes too late. The Telmessians know the meaning of the omen but they do not know that by this time Sardis has already fallen and Croesus has been captured (οὐδὲν κω εἰδότες τῶν ἦν περὶ Σάρδις τε καὶ αὐτὸν Κροῖσον – 1.78.3).[148]

There is poignancy here in Herodotus' choice of language: Croesus has seen the omen but does not understand it; the Telmessians have not seen it but can interpret it, yet do not know that their warning is too late (εἰδότες – a knowledge normally based on seeing but in this case not a full knowledge of all the facts). The geographical separation between viewer and interpreter serves to mirror the gap between seeing and understanding and thus heightens the tragedy of Croesus.

---

[147] Thus this is also a misinterpretation of motive and can be compared with the incident after the battle of Mycale where the Chians returning home on foot at night are spotted (ἰδόντες) by the Ephesians who think they are bandits planning to carry off their women, who are celebrating the Thesmophoria (6.16).

[148] Although as Asheri (2007) 137 points out, this interpretation is most likely *ex eventu* and therefore the οὐδὲν κω εἰδότες is a literary device on the part of Herodotus.

As observed throughout this chapter, an inability to interpret *opsis* correctly is often attached to those persons who will ultimately experience a severe reversal of fortune and/or commit hubris, i.e., step outside the boundaries imposed by gods on men. In this context, it is no surprise to find that loss of sight is a form of divine punishment or is linked to the divine.[149] For example, when the Cnidians start to dig through their isthmus in an attempt to turn their land into an island and protect it from Harpagus' forces, they experience many injuries, particularly to their eyes. On enquiring of the Delphic oracle, they are told that it was not Zeus' intention that their land should be an island; the Cnidians stop digging and surrender to Harpagus (1.174).[150] The divine will for once seems clear.[151] Likewise the threat made to Artabanus by Xerxes' (divinely-sent) dream is that his eyes are to be taken out with red-hot skewers, while the Pharaoh Pheros is blinded for committing the sacrilegious act of throwing a spear into the Nile (2.111).

Perhaps attempting to act as human agents of the gods, the Apollonians blind Euenius for falling asleep while guarding a sacred flock of sheep which resulted in sixty sheep being killed by wolves. However, shortly afterwards the land and the animals become barren; on enquiring of the oracles at Delphi and Dodona, the Apollonians are told that this is punishment for the blinding of Euenius as the gods had sent the wolves who killed the sacred sheep (9.93-4).[152] One wonders also if

[149] For discussion of blindness as a punishment in Ancient Greek culture see Tatti-Gartziou (2010) 182-3, specifically on blindness as a divine punishment, particularly in relation to the crossing of divinely set boundaries; see Létoublon (2010) on blindness as a *topos* in Ancient Greek myth.

[150] As noted by Harrison (2000a) 64-5, 238-40 and (2003a) 242, the divine sets the boundaries for human action and the Cnidians' punishment shows that 'man should let his environment be' (as well as being a kind of miracle), which is in turn linked to the Herodotean motif of the mutability of human fortune, the overstepping of these boundaries precipitating an inevitable downturn in that fortune. However, see Scullion (2006) 193-4 for a slightly different view: he argues that Herodotus' objection to the breaching of natural boundaries (such as Xerxes' bridging of the Hellespont) as being sacrilegious is not so clear cut (though it may demonstrate hubristic tendencies) – one cannot universalise from the Cnidian episode. See further the discussion above at n.136 on the significance of crossing natural boundaries.

[151] See Parker (2011) 9 for discussion of this episode in the context of events which appear to have divine causes.

[152] See Griffiths (1999) who characterises this episode as part of the ring composition in Books 1 and 9 of the *Histories*, the Euenius story having its counterpart in the tale of Arion and the dolphin at 1.24, both examining the theme of suffering and redemption; also Tatti-Gartziou (2010) 185-6 who analyses the story in the context of blinding forming part of both a human and divine system of justice.

the point being made here is that deprivation of sight is a divine punishment which should therefore not be meted out by human agents.[153] The link between a loss of sight and the divine is also shown by the experience of the Athenian Epizelus who goes blind during the battle of Marathon after seeing a huge phantom (divine?) figure in the melée (6.117).[154]

It was explored in Chapter 3 how one reason for the supremacy of *opsis* over other sources of information is its link to the divine – as the *Iliad* (2.484-6) states, the gods see and therefore know everything. Thus it is logical that deprivation of sight should in many cases have a divine element; we know that in Ancient Greek culture seers and other interpreters of divine signs were often portrayed as blind, and indeed the blinded Euenius attains the gift of divination after his loss of sight (9.94.3).[155] Sophocles makes much of the fact that the blind seer Tiresias is the only person for much of *Oedipus Tyrannos* who can 'see' the truth of Oedipus' situation, whereas Oedipus who has his sight cannot see. Teiresias asks Oedipus: 'You are pleased to mock my blindness. But have you eyes, and do not see your own damnation? Eyes, and cannot see the company you keep?' (λέγω δ', ἐπειδὴ καὶ τυφλόν μ' ὠνείδισας: σὺ καὶ δέδορκας κού βλέπεις ἵν' εἶ κακοῦ, οὐδ' ἔνθα ναίεις, οὐδ' ὅτων οἰκεῖς μέτα – 412-14). Ironically, Oedipus marks the moment when he finally sees the truth by blinding himself.[156]

---

[153] There are, however, plenty of examples of blinding being used as a human punishment. In the *Histories* see for example the King of Bisaltia and Crestonia's blinding of his own sons as punishment for joining Xerxes' expedition against Greece contrary to his orders (8.116).

[154] Hornblower and Pelling (2017) 260-2 discuss the unusual nature of this epiphany and the 'demythologising' explanations which have been proffered for Epizelus' blindness. Platt (2011) 14-15 highlights the appearance of gods in battle as a long-established theme in Greek antiquity, especially in the Hellenistic period when ἐπιφάνεια is first attested as a substantive noun in civic inscriptions (25). See Pritchett (1979) 11-46 for a compilation and discussion of examples of military epiphanies from historical sources (he records forty-nine).

[155] Possibly the removal of the distractions of the physical (visual) world leave room for this different kind of (prophetic) sight. See Flower (2008) for a discussion of the role of the seer in Ancient Greek culture, in particular 37 and 50 on blindness as a key attribute of the seer and its replacement by an 'inner vision'; Parker (1997) 146 on the role of the seer in Greek tragedy, with specific reference to Tiresias.

[156] See Goldhill (1996) 20 on the paradoxes of the connections between sight and knowledge in the play.

Prophetic seers appear to occupy a position somewhere between mortals and gods, their blindness removing them from the bounds of society and thus making them more receptive to seeing the divine, while the blind poet is something of a *topos*, one who can sing the deeds of both gods and men.[157] This connection further marks out *opsis* from the other senses as being in some way privileged above them.

This chapter has examined how characters in the narrative struggle with, or are unwittingly at the mercy of, *opsis*, either by misinterpreting its message (as in the erroneous analysis of dreams), by trying and failing to harness it for personal gain, or by giving in to an excessive desire to see which directly or indirectly produces dire consequences. This picture is in contrast with the portrayal of *opsis* we have noted in the metanarrative, where it is shown as the pre-eminent source for any investigation (*historie*), at least in the hands of Herodotus as investigator.

Yet despite the difficulties with *opsis* encountered in the narrative, it is still clear that great value is placed on *opsis* by the characters, both as a source (see the story about Zopyrus and the mule at 3.153.1) and as a tool for persuasion (the creation of visual propaganda) which is presumably why Herodotus highlights episodes involving *opsis* as a trigger for momentous events in his narrative. In this sense, there is an obvious link between the role played by *opsis* as a source in the metanarrative and the significance afforded to it by the characters in the narrative.

The eighteen dream episodes in the text form a key part of the characters' failure to interpret *opsis*. Although the divine origin of dreams is not made as obvious as in the Homeric texts, Herodotus clearly signifies the divine source for some significant dreams, i.e., those which herald dramatic events or a reversal of fortune, while possibly leaving the door open on a rational theory for other dreams. Ultimately in most cases, the dreamers are the unwitting agents of the dreams' fulfilment which often holds an element of dramatic irony for Herodotus' audience.[158] This prompts us to question the purpose of dreams which appear to

[157] See Lovatt (2013) 122-61 for exploration of the prophetic gaze in epic, esp. 149-54 on the link between prophetic figures and the motif of blindness. She points out (161) that prophetic vision is thus a double-edged sword: this gift of a special kind of vision is usually offset by blindness and social exclusion or (for women) some kind of sexual violation.

[158] See Grethlein (2013) 203-5 on dramatic irony used in a similar context in the text – oracles.

foretell or warn against future events but cause the dreamer to take certain actions which seal his fate.

From the analysis undertaken, these dreams would appear to have two key purposes: first, in the narrative they ensure that the dreamer's fate is fulfilled by human rather than divine agency. As we saw from Apollo's explanation to Croesus of the fall of Sardis in Book 1, Croesus' fate was unavoidable yet (arguably paradoxically) he brought it about himself by launching an attack on Persia, believing the oracle predicted the Persian empire (rather than his own) would fall, i.e., it was an action he chose to take. Thus the dream becomes a vehicle, perhaps sent by the gods, to prompt humans to take certain actions, but those actions are ultimately those which they determine.

Second, for Herodotus as narrator, dreams work as a narrative motif to mark out those figures who are about to undergo a reversal of fortune and/or to herald imminent regime change. This forms part of the broader theme within the *Histories* of the endless cycle of fortune and the rise and fall of great empires. In this sense the appearance and misinterpretation of dreams is also an element of the language of signs in the text which Hollmann has described.[159]

As noted above, those characters who are unable to interpret the meaning of their dreams correctly or who fail to use *opsis* successfully are often persons who have committed some kind of transgression by breaching a physical, cultural or religious boundary and/or committing hubris. One might consider the excessive desire to see as demonstrated by Xerxes and (indirectly) by Candaules as the breach of an *opsis* boundary which mirrors the breach of these other limits by both men.

Yet these conclusions potentially throw up some problems with the overall portrayal of *opsis* in the *Histories*, for as was discussed in Chapter 3, it is Herodotus' own thirst for seeing (or θεωρία) which drives much of his investigation and provides the evidence to support his account of the world. Further, as highlighted earlier in this chapter, Cyrus adopts Herodotus' own language of proof to reach an erroneous conclusion based on *opsis* (his dream about Darius: ὡς δὲ ταῦτα

[159] Hollmann (2011).

ἀτρεκέως οἶδα, ἐγὼ σημανέω (1.209.3)). How can this more positive and reliable image of *opsis* as a source in Herodotus' hands be reconciled with the frequent misinterpretations of it by characters in the narrative?[160]

Thus far, we have established that Herodotus has constructed a tripartite relationship in the *Histories* between himself as narrator, the characters in his narrative and the audience listening to that narrative. *Opsis* clearly plays a major role for all three: for Herodotus as investigator, sifting and judging the evidence for his enquiry; for the characters in trying to interpret and understand the world and in doing so demonstrating the benefits and pitfalls of using *opsis*; and for the audience in learning how to use *opsis* successfully. These different experiences of *opsis* may be the key to understanding the apparent contradictions in its portrayal. We will return to this question again at the end of Chapter 5.

There are two further observations to make. First, in contrast with Xerxes and Candaules, Herodotus' θεωρία is fuelled by his desire for knowledge, not just for seeing for its own sake. This is demonstrated by the passage on the origins of Heracles discussed in Chapter 3 where he gives his desire to know more about this matter (θέλων δὲ τούτων πέρι σαφές τι εἰδέναι) as the reason for his decision to travel to Tyre and Thasos to view the temples there (2.43-4). Thus there may be a difference in motive between Herodotus and the characters in the text who misuse *opsis*.

Second, as already mentioned, the failure by some characters to interpret or use *opsis* successfully is clearly a narrative motif which marks out those affected as having overstepped a boundary (broken a *nomos*) or being in some way ill-fated (Gyges entreats Candaules not to compel him to behave in a way which breaches custom (ἀνόμων – 1.8.4)). One might suggest that these transgressions are linked to, or are even the cause of, the breakdown of the relationship with *opsis*. Just as the deprivation of sight has been shown to be a form of divine punishment, so a failure to interpret *opsis* could be seen as another form of penalty meted out to

[160] This double aspect of *opsis* is also familiar from Greek tragedy: as Zeitlin (1994) 141 puts it, 'sight is a privileged source of knowledge; it is also the delusive basis of appearance'. Thus the audience sees the drama both through the eyes of the characters who may be deceived in some way by what they see, but also through their own eyes, being able to perceive certain things about the characters' situations which they cannot.

those who, in Herodotus' words, are 'fated to come to a bad end' (so of Candaules: χρῆν γὰρ Κανδαύλῃ γενέσθαι κακῶς – 1.8.2).

Therefore the audience learns from the narrative that the interpretation of *opsis* is not a straightforward task: while the conclusion of the analysis of the metanarrative in Chapters 2 and 3 was that *opsis* provides the most reliable form of evidence, Chapter 4 has shown how Herodotus teaches his audience that it is still entirely possible to misinterpret the message. Yet despite this clear warning from the narrator, there are also plenty of examples in the narrative of characters who are successful in harnessing *opsis* for their own gain (often by exploiting the Herodotean maxim that 'people believe their eyes more than their ears') or who, like Herodotus, are able to interpret correctly its message. These fellow 'masters of *opsis*' will be examined in the next chapter.

Chapter 5
Opsis in the Narrative:
Masters of *Opsis*

φάναι παρὰ σφίσι γενέσθαι ἀνδρῶν δυναστέων παῖδας ὑβριστάς, τοὺς ἄλλα τε μηχανᾶσθαι ἀνδρωθέντας περισσὰ καὶ δὴ καὶ ἀποκληρῶσαι πέντε ἐωυτῶν ὀψομένους τὰ ἔρημα τῆς Λιβύης, καὶ εἴ τι πλέον ἴδοιεν τῶν τὰ μακρότατα ἱδομένων

'[The Nasamones] told how some bold chiefs' sons of their tribe, once they had reached adulthood, concocted a number of extraordinary schemes, including casting lots to choose five of their number to go and explore the Libyan desert, to find out if they could see further than the furthest they had ever seen'

Histories, 2.32.3

5.1: Introduction

The Nasamones are a Libyan tribe of particular interest to Herodotus. He describes their expeditions into the Libyan desert in fantastical terms which are typical of his narration of forays into 'exotic' lands, noting the strange landscape and dwarf-like inhabitants they come across in their travels. But perhaps it is the reason for their quest which fascinates him most: the desire 'to see further than the furthest they had ever seen' (πλέον ἴδοιεν τῶν τὰ μακρότατα ἱδομένων), in other words, a determination to expand their knowledge of the world through travel and empirical investigation, which of course reminds us of Herodotus' own passion for personal enquiry.[1]

The previous chapter focused on those instances in the narrative where characters struggle to interpret the evidence of *opsis* or fail to deploy autopsy effectively, usually with disastrous consequences. The conclusion was that the narrative paints a more complex picture of our relationship with *opsis* as a trustworthy source of knowledge than is depicted in the metanarrative (see Chapters 2 and 3).

[1] For the interrelation between space and time in Greek historiography, see in particular Alonso-Núñez (2002) 17 ('in the descriptions of lands and coasts we have the base for the idea of space, whereas in the genealogies we find the notion of time'), de Jong and Nünlist (2007), Clarke (2008, 2018), Purves (2010), Grethlein and Krebs (2012) and de Jong (2012b).

This chapter investigates a different category of characters who, like Herodotus, appreciate the value of eyewitness and are capable of interpreting the evidence of *opsis* better to understand the world around them or who successfully harness *opsis* for their own gain.

5.2: Visual Deceptions

From Homer's *Odyssey* onwards (the eponymous hero's epithet is 'wily' – πολύτροπος), we find the glorification of cleverness, successful disguises and deceptions in Greek literature and culture, the Trojan horse being perhaps the most famous example.[2] In the *Histories*, there are many tales of tricks and deceptions – Ariston's plan to take his best friend's wife (6.62) or Democedes' plot to get home to Croton on the pretext of a scouting mission for Darius (3.136).[3] Cyrus himself comments on the Greek practice of deceiving one another when buying and selling goods in the *agora* (1.153.1). Even those deceptions involving non-Greeks have a distinctly Greek flavour, such as the multiple tricks of the Egyptian builder who built Rhampsinitus' treasury (he returns to steal the treasure and ends up marrying the pharaoh's daughter) who is deemed the 'most intelligent man in the world' by reason of his cunning (πλεῖστα ἐπισταμένῳ ἀνθρώπων – 2.121ζ.2) or Darius' groom Oebares' clever trick with his master's horse which ensures Darius will be king of Persia (3.85-87).[4]

---

[2] See Luraghi (2014) 73: the attribute of *metis* (cunning) was not usually seen as a negative one in Greek culture.

[3] See Lateiner (1990a) for deceptions in Herodotus; Dewald (1993) 63-5 discusses the celebration of the trickster figure in the *Histories*, while Marincola (2006) 20 notes that trickery is often associated with success. See also Branscome (2013) for some of the key deceptions (or attempts at deception) in the narrative. Hesk (2000), who examines the use of deception in thought, rhetoric and practice in democratic Athens, discusses (51-2) the indictment of the Athenian general Miltiades by Xanthippus on the charge of deceiving the Athenians, as described by Herodotus (6.136.1), for failing to fulfil his promise to bring the Athenians riches through conquest. He suggests this episode is evidence of a specific charge of deceiving the *demos* in early fifth century BC Athens.

[4] Lloyd (2007) 327 points out that the wily thief motif has parallels in most cultures; Asheri (2007) 477 likens Oebares to the cunning slave of ancient comedy; see Luraghi (2014) 75-81 for discussion on the trickster figure as a cross-cultural phenomenon and 81-5 on the similarities of his attributes to those of Greek tyrants.

Of course the manipulation of *opsis* is often a key ingredient in many deceptions, the clever trickster using the maxim that 'men trust their eyes more than their ears' (ὦτα γὰρ τυγχάνει ἀνθρώποισι ἐόντα ἀπιστότερα ὀφθαλμῶν – 1.8.2) more easily to persuade their victims of a certain set of facts or to push them towards reaching an erroneous interpretation of those facts.[5] Hence in the war between Lydia and Miletus, when the Lydian king Alyattes sends a messenger to Thrasybulus, tyrant of Miletus, in order to arrange a truce so that he can rebuild the temple of Athena his troops had burnt down, Thrasybulus orders the citizens to bring out all their remaining food supplies and put on a grand feast in the town square. When the Lydian messenger sees all this feasting and enjoyment, apparently unaffected by twelve years of war, he reports back to Alyattes who in turn deduces there is little point in continuing his assault on the city and so concludes a peace treaty with Thrasybulus (1.20-22).[6]

Thus Thrasybulus successfully uses a visual deception to give a false impression of the state of Milesian resources with significant (beneficial) consequences.[7] Interestingly, this story also involves the decision taker (Alyattes) acting on the basis of another's eyewitness account, in other words he interprets visual evidence of Miletus' apparent prosperity without seeing it for himself. This is not an uncommon theme in stories about visual deceptions and may be part of Herodotus' agenda in highlighting the dangers of relying on another's autopsy (explored in Chapter 4).

---

[5] Dewald (1985) 54 comments that an ability to use and interpret *opsis* correctly is often a characteristic of a successful trickster: 'such figures often know how to read the signs of physical objects correctly'. She draws a parallel with such figures and Herodotus' authorial persona, arguing that they share an ability to stand apart from, look at and interpret the evidence presented by the material world (60).

[6] Asheri (2007) 90 notes that a similar stratagem is attributed by Polyaenus (VI, 47) to Bias the Wise (later one of the so-called Seven Sages) during the siege of Priene.

[7] There has been much discussion among scholars of fifth-century BC views of archaic period tyrants. See Mitchell (2013) for a good overview of fifth-century BC attitudes; she takes the perhaps more controversial stance in arguing that kingship remained 'an important and legitimate political option in the world of the classical and archaic *polis*' (1) and that one-man leadership had a role to play in the Greek *polis* (Pericles being an obvious example). See also Luraghi (2014) who emphasises that the portrayal of tyranny in the archaic and classical periods is in fact complex and that both positive and negative attitudes to tyranny can be found from the archaic period onwards (see 82 on Thrasybulus' trick at 1.20-22).

Thrasybulus was aware that the Lydian herald was coming because he had been tipped off by his friend Periander, tyrant of Corinth, who learned that Alyattes had been consulting the oracle at Delphi about how to propitiate Athena and cure his illness which had started after his troops burnt down her temple in Miletus.[8]

Another episode involving Thrasybulus and Periander provides a rare example of correct interpretation of another's eyewitness.[9] Shortly after coming to power in Corinth, Periander sends a messenger to Thrasybulus to ask his advice on the best (and most secure) form of government to establish. Thrasybulus takes the messenger into the field and walks through it with him, cutting off any ears of grain which are standing above the rest. The messenger reports what he has seen and Periander successfully decodes this visual message as meaning that he should kill any outstanding citizens who might pose a threat (5.92).[10] Both Thrasybulus and Periander demonstrate an ability to use and interpret *opsis* successfully[11] which

[8] The isolation from his own citizens, but having close ties with tyrants in other cities, was another key characteristic of the tyrant in archaic Greece (see Luraghi (2015)) as was the manipulation of the citizens (Gray (1996) 365-6). For the portrayal of the Corinthian tyranny in the *Histories*, in particular in the context of tyranny more generally, see Gray (1996).

[9] See Moles (2007) in the context of Socles' speech on the Corinthian tyranny.

[10] A well-known story in antiquity; Aristotle (*Politics*, 1284a, 17-18; 1311a, 13) reverses the roles. It can also be seen as an example of sign interpretation in the *Histories*: Gray (1996) 381 notes that Periander is an expert interpreter of secret signs, a trait which tyrants tend to have in common (though it is by no means unique to them). See Salmon (1984) 199-205 for discussion on the relationship between Periander and Thrasybulus. He suggests that the story about the ears of grain may derive from Periander having 'cut the great men [of Corinth] down to size' rather than indicating that he had the leading citizens killed, as there is some evidence he restricted their access to the city. He also argues that Thrasybulus' friendship may have enabled Periander to open up communications with Lydia and Egypt; also Grethlein (2013) 218-20 noting that the episode prefigures Periander's destruction of his own family at *Histories*, 3.50-3. See also Hornblower (2013) 262-3 for commentary on this episode and van der Veen (1996) 77-83 pointing out that Periander takes Thrasybulus' advice further by treating all Corinthians badly (not just the outstanding citizens).

[11] Mitchell (2013) 46-8, 57-90 notes that one of the ways in which a Greek tyrant established his legitimacy to rule was by proving his ἀρετή or excellence. She points to success in war, victory in games and the foundation of cities as key aspects of ἀρετή, but arguably it might also include an intellectual prowess and cunning as a strategist, demonstrated by the ability to pull off successful deceptions and interpret visual evidence correctly. See also Luraghi (2015) 69 on the ability to outdo other elites or factions as one of the defining characteristics of the tyrant.

shows them (at least in Periander's case) using Herodotean methods of enquiry, a narrative feature which will be explored later in this chapter.[12]

This ability may also be seen as part of a broader trait of cunning (*metis*) which, as Luraghi has noted, is a key aspect of the Greek tyrant's character and a crucial skill given his isolation from the citizens.[13] Indeed, many tyrants, such as Peisistratus and Deioces (see further below), relied on this skill to deceive the people into handing them power.[14] However, as was noted above, cunning was an attribute generally admired rather than disapproved of in Ancient Greek culture and in this context Dewald has suggested that the success of tyrants such as Thrasybulus and Peisistratus to some extent counters the traditional idea that the *Histories* presents a largely negative portrayal of the Greek tyrants.[15] Thus it is not impossible to view the tyrant's success at manipulating *opsis* for his own ends in something of a positive light.

Another extremely successful visual deception is practised by the Persian Zopyrus in order to bring about the fall of Babylon to Darius' forces during the Babylonian revolt (3.154-160). Zopyrus disfigures himself by cutting off his nose and ears,

---

[12] De Bakker (2012) 121 following Christ (1994) comments that Herodotus ascribes enquiring methods similar to his own to kings and tyrants to such an extent that it could be described as 'a defining element in [their] characterisation'; see also Grethlein (2013) 186-7 on this point and 191-2 and (2009) 205-8 on the parallels between Herodotus and Xerxes as recorders of history; Demont (2009) on the *mise en abîme* effect of enquiring characters in the narrative of Herodotus' enquiry; Gray (1997) 129 on Croesus' enquiries into the relative strengths of the Athenians and the Spartans as mirroring Herodotus' investigative methods. De Jong (2012a) 136 also notes the Herodotean pattern of a king carrying out enquiries, e.g., Periander in relation to Arion's story (1.23-4) (for which also see Gray (2001)) or Proteus questioning Alexander (2.115) (for discussion of these episodes, see later in this chapter). Baragwanath (2008) 78-80 has pointed out that the way in which some of Herodotus' characters (e.g., Leonidas) imitate his own interest in determining people's motivations for certain actions highlights his own belief in enquiry into human motivation as a key part of his conception of history. Similarly, Irwin (2014) 26-8 notes more broadly this 'self-reflexive' aspect of the narrative, for example, the way in which Cambyses' spies reconnoitre the Ethiopians mirrors Herodotus' own Ethiopian enquiry (3.17-26) though in this case the parallel is between Herodotus and the spies, not Cambyses (30, 41).

[13] Luraghi (2014) 73 and (2015) 73-4. However, he rejects (2014: 74) as too simplistic the view (as put forward by Lavelle (2005)) that 'The image of the tyrant as an extraordinarily cunning and therefore ultimately irresistible being could be a product of the retrospective need to excuse the citizens for having suffered tyranny'.

[14] See Gray (1997) 144: the active deception of the people is a necessary part of the emergence of a tyrant.

[15] Dewald (2003).

shaving his head and flogging himself before fleeing to Babylon as a 'deserter' from Darius' army claiming that it is Darius who has treated him cruelly. It is the sight of Zopyrus' terrible injuries in addition to the success of his brief forays outside the city where he massacres some Persian troops (in accordance with his plan hatched with Darius) which convinces the Babylonians that his story is genuine. But then in Trojan horse style, Zopyrus secretly opens the gates of the city to Darius' forces and Babylon is swiftly captured by the Persians.[16]

This episode is rich in *opsis* references. It is significant that Herodotus makes a direct link between the sight of Zopyrus' injuries and the willingness of the Babylonians to trust him: οἱ δὲ Βαβυλώνιοι ὁρῶντες ἄνδρα τὸν ἐν Πέρσῃσι δοκιμώτατον ῥινός τε καὶ ὤτων ἐστερημένον μάστιξί τε καὶ αἵματι ἀναπεφυρμένον, πάγχυ ἐλπίσαντες λέγειν μιν ἀληθέα καί σφι ἥκειν σύμμαχον ἐπιτρέπεσθαι ἔτοῖμοι ἦσαν τῶν ἐδέετο σφέων ('The sight of one of the most distinguished Persians without his nose and ears and covered in blood and welts from being flogged inclined the Babylonians to believe he was telling the truth and had come as their ally, and they were happy to entrust him with everything he asked of them' – 3.157.1).[17]

The dramatic visual impact of his injuries (which had so shocked Darius: Δαρεῖος δὲ κάρτα βαρέως ἤνεικε ἰδὼν ἄνδρα δοκιμώτατον λελωβημένον, ἔκ τε τοῦ θρόνου ἀναπηδήσας ἀνέβωσέ – 3.155.1) is the trigger for their belief in his account.[18] Zopyrus is clearly well aware of the persuasive power of evidence based on *opsis*.

---

[16] Clearly there is more than one parallel with the Trojan War narrative here: for example, in Homer's *Odyssey*, Helen recalls how Odysseus managed to enter Troy dressed like a beggar after an apparent beating (IV, 242ff). Of course, famously Odysseus also manages to infiltrate his own home on Ithaca in the guise of a beggar at the end of the story. Asheri (2007) 523-7 notes the Homerisms throughout this passage. There is also some similarity with the behaviour of Peisistratus (*Histories*, 1.59) which is discussed in more detail below.

[17] Dewald (1993) 60 cites this episode as an example of how objects and images require interpretation and it is therefore part of a broader pattern in the *Histories* of the ambiguous nature of signs; this in turn fits in with the Herodotean (and Solonian) maxim to 'look to the end' of everything (65 n.18).

[18] Asheri (2007) 526 also notes that 'Herodotus stresses the ease with which Zopyrus plays his trick, especially since he is dealing with a popular assembly'. In this context, a comparison can be found in the apparent ease with which Aristagoras convinces the Athenian assembly to support the Ionian revolt (5.97) and Peisistratus the Athenians that he is being brought back to Athens by Athena (1.60).

Interestingly, Zopyrus is also one of the few characters in the text who personally insists upon seeing for himself, in the mule episode during the same war against Babylon (3.153 – discussed further below).

Even when Darius' troops are inside the gates of Babylon, Herodotus contrasts the fate of those citizens who 'saw what [Zopyrus] had done' (οἳ μὲν εἶδον τὸ ποιηθέν) with those who did not realise the betrayal until it was too late (οἳ δὲ οὐκ εἶδον); those in the former category managed to flee to the sanctuary of Zeus at Bel, whereas the others remained at their posts and (presumably) were captured and/or killed (3.158.2). Herodotus rounds off the story by commenting that Darius so valued Zopyrus' personal sacrifice that he often said that he 'would rather see Zopyrus without his injuries than gain twenty more Babylons' (ὡς βούλοιτο ἂν Ζώπυρον εἶναι ἀπαθέα τῆς ἀεικείης μᾶλλον ἢ Βαβυλῶνάς οἱ εἴκοσι πρὸς τῇ ἑούσῃ προσγενέσθαι – 3.160.1) – although presumably from Zopyrus' point of view his injuries were a useful permanent visual reminder to the King of the debt owed: according to Herodotus, Darius' ongoing gifts were bounteous.

The Zopyrus episode again demonstrates the power of *opsis* in the hands of those who know well how to use it – it can bring about the peaceful conclusion of a twelve-year war (Miletus) or the fall of a great city. On a slightly smaller scale, yet equally significant, is the visual deception played by the Persian general Oroetes on Polycrates and his secretary Maeandrius. In order to lure Polycrates to his death in Magnesia, Oroetes promises him financial support for his military ambitions and as evidence of his good faith, requests that he send a trusted adviser to view his treasury. Polycrates sends Maeandrius; on arrival, Oroetes shows him eight chests which appear to be full of gold but are in fact packed with stones and just a top layer of real treasure. It is Maeandrius' report about these resources which persuades Polycrates to make the journey to Magnesia where he meets a gruesome death at Oroetes' hands (3.122-125).[19]

A tragic end is on the cards for Polycrates after the ring and fish episode and so his chances of avoiding being taken in by this trick were never very high – even guest-friend Amasis had broken off his alliance with him (see Chapter 4) because he

[19] See Pelling (2016) for discussion of a possible tradition of storytelling about Polycrates' death, as may be evidenced by a fragment of Stesimbrotus.

realised that the consequences of divine jealously at Polycrates' good fortune could not be averted (3.43).[20]

In line with the Herodotean narrative motif, explored in the previous chapter, that those who are ill-fated are also dogged by an inability to interpret or handle *opsis* successfully (Xerxes being the most notable example), Polycrates both ignores the significance of his daughter's ominous dream and (as with Alyattes above) makes the mistake of relying on another's *opsis* as evidence of Oroetes' good intentions. The contrast between Polycrates' initial good fortune and his grim ending is underlined by the juxtaposition of the words for good fortune and death in Herodotus' concluding remark on this episode: Πολυκράτεος μὲν δὴ αἱ πολλαὶ εὐτυχίαι ἐς τοῦτο ἐτελεύτησαν τῇ οἱ Ἄμασις ὁ Αἰγύπτου βασιλεὺς προεμαντεύσατο (3.125.4).

Polycrates' motives here are also misguided: Herodotus highlights his desire for money as the trigger for sending Maeandrius to inspect the gold and we have already established the dangers of excessive desire (ἔρως) in Chapter 4.[21] Ironically, Maeandrius later sets up a visual memorial of his former master by dedicating Polycrates' furniture to the temple of Hera on Samos – well worth seeing (ἀξιοθέητον) in Herodotus' opinion (3.123.1). A visual memorial is perhaps not entirely appropriate for one who has largely failed in any mastery of *opsis*.

This narrative can also be seen as part of Herodotus' ongoing exploration of the value of real, as opposed to what we might term spiritual, wealth. From the famous meeting between Croesus and Solon at the beginning of the work in which Croesus interprets his fabulous wealth as a guarantee of happiness but Solon understands it as immaterial unless a man also has good fortune up to the end of his life, we are presented with differing views on the value of tangible wealth. Polycrates' desire for it is ultimately his undoing, yet Alcmaeon profits from placing value on worldly treasure and founds a great dynasty using the gifts from Croesus' treasury.

[20] See Versnel (2011) 181ff for a discussion of divine envy in Herodotus and archaic Greek literature. As was discussed in Chapter 4, divine envy at human prosperity is a recurrent theme in the *Histories* and guarantees that good fortune does not last.

[21] Asheri (2007) 508 feels there is an implicit moral condemnation from Herodotus here. This touches on another important element of *opsis* narratives in the *Histories* – their potentially didactic purpose, for more on which see later in this chapter.

Perhaps Herodotus is leaving it up to his audience to decide how we should interpret the sight of wealth, whether to be impressed by it or, like Solon, to try to see past it to something of greater value.[22]

Having killed Polycrates, Oroetes is in turn murdered by his own guards at the behest of Darius in punishment (3.128). Another example of a completely successful visual ruse is provided by the Athenian tyrant Peisistratus who together with his sons ruled Athens on and off between 561 and 510 BC (1.59-60). Peisistratus originally managed to seize power in Athens by means of a visual trick (there are parallels with the Zopyrus episode here): he wounds himself and his mules and then drives into the centre of the city claiming that he has been attacked by his enemies and demanding provision of personal guards. The Athenians are convinced by his story and provide the guards, but then he uses these men to start an uprising and seize power (1.59).[23] Notably (and appropriately given his intelligent approach to *opsis*), according to Aristotle and Plutarch, Solon was the only person to oppose this request.[24]

Later Peisistratus is expelled from the city by his political enemies, but engineers his return with his new ally Megacles by dressing a tall and striking woman called Phye as Athena and having her lead him back into the city, with heralds proclaiming that 'Athena' is bringing back Peisistratus to install him as their leader once again (1.60).[25] This stratagem actually worked, much to Herodotus' astonishment – indeed, one would have thought the Athenians would have been

[22] See Asheri (2007) 391-2 for discussion on the theme of truth and falsehood in Book 3 of the *Histories*.

[23] Luraghi (2014) 82 notes that a common attribute of tyrants is to convince the citizens that the tyrant is something other than he really is as a key step to gaining power.

[24] Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.*, 14.2: Solon claimed to be 'wiser than some [in recognising that Peisistratus' real aim was tyranny] and braver than others [who also realised what was going on but were afraid to speak out]' (τῶν μὲν εἴη σοφώτερος, τῶν δ' ἀνδρειότερος); Plutarch, *Life of Solon*, 30, presumably following Aristotle.

[25] Platt (2011) 15 n.55 among others has pointed out that Phye's name means 'noble stature' and is an epithet applied to the most noble of mortals in the Homeric poems, with the result that Phye's status seems to be somewhere between human and divine; see also Gray (1997) 145-6 making the same point. Platt (2011) 20 also highlights the fluid relationship between deity, human body and material object in Greek culture. Parker (1996) 84-6 explores the links between Phye's appearance and contemporary depictions of Athena with heroes (Heracles and Theseus).

doubly sceptical of any Peisistratus-led affair after having been deceived by him previously.[26]

However, in both these Peisistratus episodes Herodotus avoids the use of *opsis* language, almost as though to underline his disbelief that the Athenians ('supposedly the most intelligent of all Greeks' (τοῖσι πρώτοισι λεγομένοισι εἶναι Ἑλλήνων σοφίην – 1.60.3)) should be hoodwinked in this way.[27] It should also be noted that, as Herodotus mentions, many of the Athenians (those who lived in the country demes) would have heard about Athena bringing back Peisistratus rather than seeing the event for themselves (1.60.6) and thus their knowledge of the affair was based on a less reliable form of evidence.[28]

It is important to view this story both in the broader context of Athenian religious practices and Herodotus' relationship with, and views on, Athens.[29] There have been numerous interpretations of this passage.[30] Such staged epiphanies continued to be a feature in Greek culture: see, for example, Plutarch's account of the rout of the invading Aetolians at Pellene in 241 BC who see a beautiful girl running out of the sanctuary of Artemis and think it is the goddess herself defending the Achaean forces.[31]

---

[26] See Gray (1997) for discussion of the way in which Herodotus places Peisistratus' rise to power in the context of the comparison between Athens and Sparta and the later rise of Athens as a great power.

[27] Herodotus clearly expresses his doubts by using the conditional: ἀλλὰ τότε γε οὗτοι ἐν Ἀθηναίοισι τοῖσι πρώτοισι λεγομένοισι εἶναι Ἑλλήνων σοφίην μηχανῶνται τοιάδε. Harrison (2000a) 90-1 points out that this disbelief may be taken as evidence that by Herodotus' day, there was greater scepticism about the possibility of such direct divine apparitions. Lavelle (2005) 100 argues that the source for this story is likely to be Alcmaeonid and thus the criticism of the Athenian *demos* here has a distinctly Alcmaeonid flavour – Herodotus' 'disbelief' may even be disingenuous (106).

[28] See Parker (1996) 83-4 on this episode.

[29] See Parker (1996) in particular for context on the changes in Athenian religious practices during the archaic period.

[30] See Harrison (2000a) 90 n.74 and Asheri (2007) 123 for bibliography on this episode.

[31] Plutarch, *Life of Aratus*, 32.1-2, noted by Platt (2011) 13 who also points out (15) that Peisistratus' return with 'Athena' is the first in a historiographical tradition of staged epiphanies, the epiphany being a key element of Greek religion (see Chapter 4 for further discussion of epiphanies). See Harrison (2000a) 90-92 for discussion of this episode in the context of epiphanies in Greek culture.

Parker notes the evidence this narrative provides for the power of the cult of Athena in sixth-century BC Athens and the growing importance of the Acropolis as the religious and political heart of the city given that it is the focus of Peisistratus' bid for power in both episodes. He also favours an interpretation that views the procession with Athena not as a trick but as a piece of theatre performed in front of a knowing Athenian audience.[32] Lateiner agrees that 'Athena's' appearance would have been regarded as a symbolic rather than a literal manifestation of the goddess, political manipulation of religious ideas being a real possibility in Herodotus' day,[33] while Connor argues that in this kind of event the spectators are merely participating in a 'shared drama'.[34]

Indeed, the episode has an element of Greek drama about it (a bit like a *deus ex machina* moment) and Goldhill has commented that it could be taken as a starting point in the history of the performative elements of Athenian democracy.[35] Famously, Aristophanes also incorporated this episode (by reference) into his play *Birds*, where the protagonist Peisthetairos enters Cloud-Cuckoo Land in procession with his bride Basileia (1708ff). Bowie argues that entrance in a chariot is implied here and that there are other clear parallels with the Peisistratus episode: Peisistratus had married Megacles' daughter and the name of Aristophanes' protagonist (Peisthetairos = Peisistratus) cannot be a coincidence.[36]

We know that the *Panathenaea*, the great religious festival held at Athens every year (though the *Greater Panathenaea* was held every four years) which involved a sacrificial procession to the Acropolis, was recast in the second quarter of the sixth century BC. According to Parker, at least one source credits Peisistratus for the

[32] Parker (1996) 83-4: 'Phye was, as it were, an actress playing Athena, and the spectators, not deceived, went along with the fiction as an expression of the truth that Pisistratus was the man of the hour for Athena's city'.

[33] Lateiner (1990a) 237. See also Lavelle (2005) 100, in agreement that the Athenians were not in fact deceived; Luraghi (2014) 87: the episode was amusing. Cf. Gray (1997) 145-6 arguing that Peisistratus' trick is a genuine deception of the *demos* in character with the prototype emergence of a tyrant – Phye's noble stature is a metaphor for Peisistratus' own growing power.

[34] Connor (1987) 44; see also Baragwanath (2012) 50-2: 'The stage-managed feel of the episode ... introduces the possibility that the Athenians are *colluding* in Pisistratus' theatre'.

[35] Goldhill (1999) 10.

[36] Bowie (1993) 165, 171. For further discussion of this connection, see Kavoulaki (1999) 313-19, especially 317-8.

reforms which included the establishment of the *Greater Panathenaea* in or around the 560s, the athletic and musical competitions and the great procession through the agora to the Acropolis to present a robe to Athena which of course would have been a great visual spectacle.[37]

It is tempting to see Peisistratus' return with Athena as part of this growing cult of the goddess in sixth-century Athens, especially as this development appears to be linked to Peisistratus or his sons. It is only appropriate that a story evolved that his return was sanctioned by the goddess, an extraordinary spectacle which sounds almost as though it were part of the *Panathenaea* procession (although ironically, Harmodius and Aristogiton chose the *Panathenaea* of 514 BC to depose the Peisistratids by murdering Hipparchus, Peisistratus' son).

Moreover, scholars have frequently noted both the performative and visual nature of Greek (and particularly Athenian) ritual and cultic practice, especially in the character of processions, and the announcement made by the heralds who proclaim Peisistratus' return follows a cultic formula: ὦ Ἀθηναῖοι, δέκεσθε ἀγαθῷ νόῳ Πεισίστρατον, τὸν αὐτὴ ἡ Ἀθηναίη τιμήσασα ἀνθρώπων μάλιστα κατάγει ἐς τὴν ἐωυτῆς ἀκρόπολιν (1.60.5).[38] In his exploration of θεωρία (pilgrimage) in Ancient Greece, a word whose origins mean 'spectating', Rutherford notes that visual experience was a key component of Greek religion, the 'spectacle' being an important part of the festival which pilgrims would have travelled to see.[39]

Sinos has analysed this episode in the context of procession scenes as depicted on black-figure vases, especially where gods accompany heroes (Athena and Heracles is a relatively popular scene in sixth-century BC Athenian vase painting) to conclude that Peisistratus was attempting to portray himself as part of a tradition

[37] See Parker (1996) 78: he emphasises the stress on spectacle and entertainment in the cults of this period; the source crediting Peisistratus is Aelius Aristides, *Panath*., 189 (89); see also Parker (1996) 67-79 and 89-92 for further discussion of the development of the Acropolis and the *Panathenaea* along with other festivals in sixth-century BC Athens and the possible role of the Peisistratids in this. For an overview of the *Panathenaea* in the fifth century BC, see Maurizio (1998).

[38] See, for example, Jameson (1999) 324-6 on the *Panathenaea*, and Kavoulaki (1999) on the link between ritual procession and theatre in Greek culture, the visual element being key to both.

[39] Rutherford (2013) 142. See also Petsalis-Diomedis (2006) 214: θεωρία in the meaning of pilgrimage contains at its very heart the concept of viewing.

of heroes receiving divine sanction or support by means of the chariot procession. In this context, the Athenian reaction in accepting Peisistratus' divinely-sanctioned return merely reflects their understanding of this imagery and a willingness to participate in a recognised form of ritual drama.[40] We know that dramatisation of the advent of the god into the city was a common feature of Greek religious festivals, the god represented either by a statue carried by hand or on a cart or chariot, or (occasionally) by a priest or priestess impersonating the deity, so this sight would not have been unfamiliar to an Athenian audience.[41]

The mid-sixth century BC was also a period of great political upheaval in Athens as, according to extant sources, Peisistratus and his rivals, Megacles and Lycurgus, led the three different factions struggling for power in the city. In such a volatile environment, Peisistratus' theatrical (almost carnival-like) appearance can also be seen as a piece of propaganda promulgated by his faction, especially in the sending out of heralds to the different demes to announce his (divinely supported) return.

Although this is not the place for a detailed analysis of Herodotus' views on Athens and forms of government, it is relevant in this context to give brief consideration to Herodotus' relationship with Athens and his views on tyranny.[42] Moles comments

[40] Sinos (1993); she also points out (83-4) that examples of human recreation of divine epiphanies can be found in Greek inscriptions and literature, including Herodotus (e.g., 4.180). In her view, Herodotus' astonishment at the gullibility of the Athenians is not aimed at their belief in the appearance of the goddess, but rather the idea that she would support Peisistratus' attempt at tyranny. On the link with imagery of Athena and Heracles, cf. Connor (1987) 45-6 who comments that Peisistratus shows deliberate restraint in not portraying himself as Heracles – he is very much mortal, Athena's subordinate accompanying her back to the city and thus her chosen leader of Athens.

[41] See Parker (2011) 179-85 on the advent of the god as part of Greek festivals, in particular 183 on the use of a priest or priestess to impersonate the deity. Lavelle (2005) 103 also notes the Homeric flavour of the episode, recalling Diomedes being led into battle with Athena as charioteer (*Iliad*, 5.835ff).

[42] There are numerous scholarly discussions of Herodotus and Athens ranging from those who view Herodotus as an admirer or even an apologist for contemporary Athens to those who argue that he provides a subtle critique of the rise of Athenian imperialism. See Fornara (1971) 45-50 for debate over whether or not Herodotus was pro-Athens; Moles (2002) for a list of historic scholarship on this subject and a more recent chronological analysis; Ostwald (1991) generally for Herodotus' relationship with Athens and certain Athenian families and individuals; Fowler (2003) who takes a more thematic approach and emphasises the complexity of Herodotus' relationship with Athens; Pelling (2007) 150 alludes to the ambiguity of the portrayal of the Athenians at the end of Book 9 (on which see further below).

that the Peisistratus narrative in the *Histories* contains all the hallmarks of the Herodotean typology of tyranny, including the rending of the body politic and the gullibility of the populace.[43] Thus the total capitulation to Peisistratus on both occasions can also be viewed as part of Herodotus' critique of tyranny: we know from his comments on the role of democratic freedoms (ἰσηγορίη) in inspiring military courage and heroism that he is no particular fan of tyranny (5.78). Tyranny reduces even the intelligent Athenians to credulous fools.

However, Herodotus' criticism of the Athenians is not confined to the period of tyranny, but recurs throughout the work from the treatment of Miltiades (6.136) to (arguably) the execution of Artayctes (9.12).[44] Lateiner for one sees the Peisistratus episode as Herodotus having a good laugh at the Athenians and perhaps casting doubt on the supposed intellectual superiority of Greeks over non-Greeks by putting forward this commonly-held belief exactly at the point where it will be undermined by the Peisistratus narrative.[45]

Clearly there is a mixture of praise (Athens as saviours of Greece from the Persians – 7.139) and criticism (their support of the Ionian revolt triggered the Persian invasion in the first place – 5.97.3) in the *Histories*, but, if we were to see Herodotus more as a critic, then this episode of Athenian credulity is less surprising.[46] After all, he underlines Athenian gullibility again when Aristagoras, after no success with Cleomenes the king of Sparta, persuades the Athenians to send ships in support of the Ionian revolt, by commenting that 'it seems easier to

[43] Moles (2002) 37.

[44] Herodotus' relationship with Athens in the context of the ending of the *Histories* will be discussed later in this chapter.

[45] Lateiner (1990a) 236-7.

[46] For Herodotean praise of Athens, see also 7.138-9; 8.2-3; and 8.143-4. Yet after their involvement with the Ionian revolt, it is clear whom Darius blames, instructing a slave to repeat three times at every palace meal, 'Master, remember the Athenians' (Δέσποτα, μέμνεο τῶν Ἀθηναίων – 5.105.2) – see Harrison (2002) 557-8 on this reminder in the context of Herodotus' comment at 5.97.3 that the ships lent to Aristagoras by the Athenians during the Ionian revolt were the beginning of evils for both Greeks and barbarians. Harrison (2002) 574-5 also points out that implied praise of Athens (such as that at 7.139) may at least in part have been embedded in the *logoi* as told to Herodotus (i.e., it reflects the bias of his sources rather than his own).

fool a crowd than a single person' (πολλοὺς γὰρ οἶκε εἶναι εὐπετέστερον διαβάλλειν ἢ ἕνα – 5.97.2).[47]

Moles also argues that the apparent stupidity of the Athenians in being taken in by Peisistratus, clearly emphasised by Herodotus, is also part of his attempt to warn the Athenians about the dangers of their own growing imperialism, an event which the *Histories* testifies is bound eventually to end in disaster: the Athenians can hardly be wholly wise if they ignore the obvious moral of the work (that all great empires fall).[48]

The narrative at 1.59-60 thus needs to be considered in the context of Athenian religion and ritual practices, Greek drama, the *Histories* as a whole and in particular Herodotus' relationship with Athens and his views on tyranny.[49] While it is arguable whether the Athenians are really deceived by Peisistratus on his second return to Athens, for the present purposes it is sufficient to note that Peisistratus twice uses visual devices to give a false appearance of reality with great effect, on both occasions successfully gaining power in Athens.

Cyrus is another leader who successfully deploys a visual deception to gain a (short-term) military advantage. During his war against the Massagetae, he lays out a sumptuous feast before withdrawing with his troops, leaving only the weakest soldiers behind. The Massagetae attack and slaughter these men and then spot the feast and tuck in. While they are sleeping off the effects of food and wine, Cyrus' full army attacks and kills or captures all of them (1.207-11).

As we saw in Chapter 4, Cyrus fails to interpret *opsis* correctly (his dream about Darius – 1.209-10) but here uses *opsis* to his advantage to strike a blow against the Massagetan forces. Cyrus' mistake is to overreach himself: when Tomyris, queen of the Massagetae, offers him safe passage to leave her territory in return for her son

[47] Conversely, Hornblower (2013) 276 suggests that this episode is intended by Herodotus as a joke and would have been taken by the Athenians as such, rather than being evidence of anti-Athenian sentiment from Herodotus.

[48] See Moles (2002) 52. The role of the Persian War narrative in acting as a warning to Athenian imperialism has been much commented on by scholars: see, for example, Bowie (2012) 274 and discussion further below in relation to the use of visual propaganda by Persians and Greeks.

[49] It is therefore important to recognise with Connor (1987) 43 that it is not necessary to find a single explanation for the event.

whom Cyrus' army had captured at the feast, he refuses ('took not the slightest notice' (ἐπέων οὐδένα τούτων ἀνενειχθέντων ἐποιέετο λόγον) in Herodotus' words – 1.213) choosing instead to engage her remaining troops, the result of which is his army's defeat and his own death (1.214).[50]

Of course we know that Cyrus is doomed because Herodotus has deployed all his usual motifs to tell us this: the crossing of a natural boundary which is also symbolic of crossing the boundary which the gods/fate put on human achievement (Cyrus crosses the river Araxes into Massagetan territory – 1.209); the significant dream forewarning him of his own death which he misinterprets and which appears to him as soon as he has crossed the river (1.209-10); his belief in his own immortality (demonstrating *hubris*); and his desire for ever greater territorial expansion – see in particular Herodotus' comments on Cyrus' unshakable belief in himself and his good fortune as being the main reasons why he undertook the Massagetan expedition (πρῶτον μὲν ἡ γένεσις, τὸ δοκέειν πλέον τι εἶναι ἀνθρώπου, δευτέρα δὲ ἡ εὐτυχίη ἡ κατὰ τοὺς πολέμους γενομένη – 1.204.2). Thus his arrogance in not even considering Tomyris' offer is unsurprising and merely guarantees his demise, a fact which Herodotus has already explicitly flagged to his audience at 1.209.[51]

Why, then, is Cyrus able to use *opsis* successfully on this one occasion? It is perhaps significant that the feast is actually a suggestion of Croesus' and is not Cyrus' idea at all. Croesus of course was another leader who failed to understand and interpret the evidence of *opsis*, but after the loss of his Lydian empire, his realisation of Solon's wisdom and (through consultation with Apollo) his understanding of the nature of human fate, he has been redeemed and attained a new status of wise adviser to Cyrus. Indeed, in his speech to Cyrus setting out the plan, Croesus

[50] Cyrus' disregard for Tomyris' words here is reminiscent of Croesus' dismissal of Solon's philosophy and in fact Herodotus uses similar language: οὔτε λόγου μιν ποιησάμενος οὐδενὸς ἀποπέμπεται (1.33). Given what we know at this point in the text about Croesus' fate, this repetition in turn provides a clear signal to the audience that Cyrus' end is imminent.

[51] See Chiasson (2012) 227-32 for a discussion of the Herodotean narrative of Cyrus' defeat and death in the context of patterns found in Greek myth and tragedy. He points to Herodotus' use of the word ἐπαίρω ('to excite, exhort') here, most likely borrowed from contemporary Attic tragedy, to mark out Cyrus as a ruler whose 'power and prosperity cause him to forget the inherent weakness of the human condition' (228) and whose fall is thus imminent and inevitable.

prefaces it with (Herodotean) comments on the mutability of human fate and fortune which he has learnt from his own misfortunes – τὰ δέ μοι παθήματα ἐόντα ἀχάριτα μαθήματα γέγονε (1.207.1). Thus it is in fact the enlightened Croesus who comes up with the successful visual deception and Cyrus who loses the advantage gained through it because of his arrogance (*hubris*).[52]

Nevertheless, in this episode as with all the others discussed above, the deceiver uses the greater trust placed in autopsy the more effectively to deceive others. This must have an ironic significance for Herodotus and his audience given everything we have learned from the metanarrative about the supremacy of *opsis* as a source. It is this apparent tension between these two portrayals of *opsis* which will be discussed in detail at the end of this chapter.

5.3: Successful Propaganda and the Use of *Opsis* as a Military Tactic

In the previous chapter we saw how Xerxes' attempts at visual propaganda during the Persian Wars were spectacularly unsuccessful. By contrast, after the battle of Plataea there are a few key pieces of visual propaganda on the Greek side which are much more effective. After the Persian cavalry commander Masistius has been killed (perhaps significantly by being hit in the eye) and his body recovered following a fierce tussle over it with the Persian troops, the corpse is loaded onto a cart and paraded before the Greek battle lines, which inevitably has a positive impact on morale – 'the men broke ranks to go and see him' (ἐκλειπόντες δὲ τὰς τάξις ἐφοίτεον θεησόμενοι Μασίστιον – 9.25.1), Herodotus tells us.[53] The choice of the verb θεάμαι here underlines the 'gawping' element of this gruesome display, as does the description of the corpse as θέης ἄξιος.[54]

---

[52] It is nonetheless worth noting that not all of Croesus' advice is sound: it is he who advises Cyrus to cross the river Araxes. See in particular Pelling (2006a) 167-72 for discussion of this episode and the value or otherwise of Croesus' advice here. Nevertheless, as Harrison (2000a) 44 points out, the reasoning behind crossing the Araxes was initially well-founded.

[53] See Arrington (2015) 25 on this episode and the Greek fascination with, and the visual attraction of, Persian corpses.

[54] Arguably there are echoes here of Achilles' treatment of Hector's body in the *Iliad*, tying it to the back of a cart and dragging it three times round the walls of Troy (*Iliad*, 22.395-405), although this was intended more for Trojan viewing than Greek. Flower and Marincola (2002) 145 also note the Homeric resonance with the Achaeans going to marvel at Hector's corpse at *Iliad*, 22.369-75 – the same verb is used (θηήσαντο – *Iliad*, 22.370).

Later on Pausanias creates a particularly significant piece of propaganda when he instructs the Persian general Mardonius' cooks to prepare a typical (magnificent) Persian feast and has it laid out on the gold and silver tables and couches at which Mardonius used to eat (taken as booty by the Greeks). He then has a simple Laconian meal prepared and placed alongside and invites all the Greek commanders to come and view the two very different meals. Pausanias tells them that here is visual proof of Xerxes' stupidity in invading a nation whose way of life is so meagre compared with the luxuries of Persia (9.82).

The (Herodotean) message underlying all this is that it is because of the Greek (and particularly Spartan) hardiness that they have been able to defeat the great Persian army whose culture of luxury and indulgence produces inferior men.[55] Indeed, Pausanias is set up in Book 9 as a character representing and promoting the differences in Greek and Persian values, for example when he refuses to allow the mutilation of Mardonius' corpse (in retaliation for the Persian treatment of Leonidas' body), it being a 'barbaric' rather than Greek practice – τὰ πρέπει μᾶλλον βαρβάροισι ποιέειν ἤ περ Ἕλλησι: καὶ ἐκείνοισι δὲ ἐπιφθονέομεν (9.79.1-2).[56]

Finally, Herodotus mentions that some of the tombs at Plataea, supposedly containing the dead from the great battle are in fact empty, set up (in at least one case several years after the battle) by those cities who did not take part but who wanted future generations to think they had (9.85). The ploy does not fool Herodotus, but one can only assume that many visitors would not have appreciated the difference between the genuine tombs and the cenotaphs.

Lateiner has commented on what this episode tells us about the importance of the Persian Wars in Greek history and thus of having been a part of this crucial moment in defining Greek identity,[57] but it also shows that the desire to

[55] Cf. Flower and Marincola (2002) 251 who suggest that because Pausanias is only amazed at Persian luxury rather than despising it, this episode contains the seeds of his later corruption. They also point to the irony of his laughter at 9.82.2 in this context (252). Yet such laughter could also be derisive.

[56] See Pelling (2006c) on both these episodes. As he suggests (116), there is no doubt an element of irony in Pausanias' comparison of the two feasts given his later defection to the Persians.

[57] Lateiner (1990a) 233: the episode 'attests to anxiety for the historical record in the generation that fought the Persian War, and to Herodotus' noteworthy belief that the men of the Great War

manipulate the Persian War narrative was as strong on the Greek side as the Persian (see Xerxes at 8.24-5). Flower and Marincola further point to this passage as evidence that Herodotus wanted to portray Plataea as a victory mainly for the Athenians, Spartans and Tegeans, not a pan-Hellenic one.[58] Certainly the passage seems reflective of a later time (in Herodotus' day) when internal Greek quarrels between the different city-states would have made credit for the Plataea victory of particular political importance.[59]

Why does Herodotus present us with these incidents of Greek propaganda? Clearly their success and impact contrasts with the notably unsuccessful Persian attempts to manipulate the Persian War narrative, discussed in the previous chapter: as we have already seen, Herodotus tends to link success with *opsis* to good fortune more generally, while the inability to interpret or use *opsis* is a marker of forthcoming defeat or downfall. Thus the Greeks' ability to use visual propaganda is perhaps symbolic of their ultimate success in defeating the Persians. Further, these episodes form part of the attempt in the narrative in Book 9 to show how Greek values (simplicity and freedom) have ultimately triumphed over Persian ones, as Dewald has shown.[60]

However, there is another interpretive layer here. Many scholars have noted both the elements of ring composition in Book 9 and the way in which the narrative is constructed so that the Persians' fate may act as a warning to the Athenians given that the seeds of their rise to dominance over the rest of Greece are evident in the closing chapters of the Persian War.[61] For example, the story of Protesilaus (9.116)

---

would bother to try to impose a false belief on future Hellenes about their accomplishments. It marks an epoch in popular historical consciousness'.

[58] Flower and Marincola (2002) 256.

[59] This point is noted by Boedeker (2001) 132-3 in her comparison of Herodotus' Plataea narrative and Simonides' Plataea Elegy. She also highlights the role of Simonides' poem in establishing a hero cult of those who fought and died at Plataea (134). It is likely the tombs played a similar role, hence the importance of one's city being represented among them.

[60] Dewald (1997) 65. Pausanias' comparison of the two feasts is particularly important in this context.

[61] See Fornara (1971) 40-58 for discussion of Books 7-9 in the context of Herodotus' reaction to contemporary (mid-fifth-century BC) events and the rise of Athenian power. He concludes that Herodotus was not attempting to justify the Athenian empire despite his sometimes favourable comments on the Athenian role in the Persian Wars. See also Rood (2007) 116 noting the hints of

recalls the discussion of the Trojan War at the start of the work (1.3-5);[62] Pausanias' comparison of the Persian and Greek feasts as emblematic of a luxurious and soft culture versus a rustic and hardy one recalls the use of a feast by Cyrus to overcome (temporarily) the Massagetae, a people unused to luxury, yet their ultimate triumph against him.[63]

Cyrus' comment about soft lands breeding soft men (9.122), which closes the *Histories*, has often been taken as a direct warning to the Athenians not to overreach themselves as the Persians did, in line with the hubris / nemesis theme which pervades the text;[64] in the crucifixion of Artayctes and the stoning of his son (9.120) the Athenians can be seen to be becoming like the Persians in adopting their 'barbaric' practices (in contrast with Pausanias' sentiments at 9.79, noted above), not least because it is Xanthippus, father of the great imperial leader

---

Athens' rise to dominance at the end of the *Histories*. Cf. Grethlein (2009) 196 who prefers to see the Persian War narrative not so much as a warning to the Athenians but as an account which 'offers knowledge that helps his [i.e., Herodotus'] readers understand their own time', and also Alonso-Núñez (2002) 24 who feels there is no evidence that Herodotus wished to issue a warning in relation to growing Athenian power.

[62] See Boedeker (1988) for discussion of the Protesilaus episode in the context of the structure of the end of the *Histories* and Rood (2007) 117 noting that this episode looks back to the Trojan War and thus the beginning of Greek and barbarian hostilities.

[63] See Moles (2002), Dewald (1997) 67-9 and Grethlein (2013) 206 for a discussion of the elements of ring composition evident in Book 9; Harrison (2003a) 255 for these themes in the context of Herodotus' attitudes to religion; Ostwald (1991) 147-8 for Herodotus' foresight as regards fifth-century BC Athenian history; Boedeker (1987) 198-9 for discussion of Sparta's relationship with Athens as portrayed through the narratives of Cleomenes and Demaratus as a possible foreshadowing of the Peloponnesian War; Derow (1995) 38 for the view that the closing passage of the *Histories* demonstrates that Herodotus was not in fact a great admirer of Athens; Saïd (2002) 145 for the suggestion that the narrative in Books 7-9 is that of the tragedy of Persian imperialism and thus may be read as a warning to Athenian imperialists; Grethlein (2010) 181-7 for the suggestion that elements in the 'speech duel' between the Tegeans and Athenians at Plataea (*Histories*, 9.26-7) foreshadow the later Athenian supremacy.

[64] See Dewald (1997) for discussion of the issues raised by the end of the *Histories*, in particular the contradictions posed by the portrayal of Cyrus at the end of Book 9 (wisely warning the Persians against 'soft living') and his characterisation in Book 1 (where he urges them on to conquer the Medes in pursuit of a more luxurious lifestyle – 1.125). She concludes that although a warning to the Athenians is one possible interpretation of Book 9, Herodotus in fact leaves the door open on the true meaning of the closing chapters of the work, recognising that contemporary history can only be fully understood by the passage of time (81-2). Such a philosophy is reminiscent of Solon's belief that one can only draw conclusions about the good fortune or otherwise of a man's present circumstances at the end of his life; see further below for discussion of Solon's visit to Croesus and his reaction to seeing the Lydian king's great wealth. Asheri (2006) 342, by contrast, suggests that scholars have tried too hard to find closural or ring composition elements in 9.122.

Pericles, who orders these deaths.[65] A slightly different approach is taken by Raaflaub who sees the Persian War narrative in Books 7-9 not so much as a warning to the Athenians directly as an attempt to educate the audience about the dangers of Athenian expansion by narrating the story of Persian imperialism.[66]

There is also particular irony in it being Pausanias who sets up the two contrasting feasts given that he would go on to be 'Medised' i.e., conceive a desire to become tyrant of Greece (ἔρωτα σχὼν τῆς Ἑλλάδος τύραννος γενέσθαι (5.32) – that transgressive ἔρως again), take to a luxurious, Persian way of life and eventually collaborate with the Persians, as Thucydides tells us.[67] Of special interest in this context is the comment that Pausanias 'held banquets in the Persian manner' (τράπεζάν τε Περσικὴν παρετίθετο – Thucydides, 1.130.1), enjoying the very feasts he had once rejected.[68]

Finally, it is worth noting that a visual element is often a key part of successful military strategy in the *Histories*. Cyrus uses camels in his battle against Croesus' forces, the sight of which causes the horses of the Lydian cavalry to flee (1.80); the Scythians make a show of whips when fighting their rebellious slaves to frighten them into submission (4.3-4); and at Thermopylae the Spartans pretend to run away only to turn upon and slaughter the Persians who chase after them (7.211.3).

---

[65] See Steiner (1994) 156-7 who suggests that this appropriation by the Athenians of an Oriental type of commemoration of their victory constitutes one of the signs in the text that they will in future attempt to build an empire equal to that of the Persians; also Grethlein (2013) 207.

[66] Raaflaub (2010) 200: 'Herodotus, I suggest, recognised a highly dramatic and problematic issue in the politics of his time. Athens' "imperialistic impulse" had escalated to the point of becoming Mediterranean imperialism gone mad, threatening the entire Greek world as he knew it. He thus decided to describe earlier instances of Persian imperialism in terms that could not fail to make his contemporaries recognise the pattern'.

[67] 1.95, 128-34. However, it is worth noting that Herodotus does cast doubt on Pausanias' motivations here: εἰ δὴ ἀληθής γέ ἐστι ὁ λόγος (5.32).

[68] Of course Pausanias was a Spartan general, not an Athenian one, but his recall by the Spartans to answer for his grandiose behaviour gave the Athenians the opportunity to assume leadership of the Greek allies (Thucydides, 1.96.1, 130.2). Herodotus goes further in proposing that Pausanias' arrogant behaviour (*hubris*) was used by the Athenians as a pretext or excuse (πρόφασις) to take control. See Hornblower (2011) 9-10, 35 for discussion of the different interpretations of Herodotus and Thucydides on whether the Athenians used Pausanias' violent behaviour as an excuse to take the hegemony. See also Hall (1989) 203-4 on Pausanias' behaviour in the context of the characterisation of ostracised aristocrats with tyrannical or oligarchic leanings in the 480s BC as 'Medes'.

These brief episodes further illustrate the way in which the text continually underlines the power of the visual.

5.4: The Power of Denying *Opsis* to Others

In view of the power which can be gained through manipulation of *opsis*, it is perhaps no surprise to find that denial of *opsis* – and therefore knowledge – to others can also be used as an effective method of control. The Magus Smerdis usurps the Persian throne from Cambyses while the latter is away in Egypt by pretending to be Cambyses' brother Smerdis (in fact already murdered by Cambyses) – the Magus is able to retain his power by remaining unseen (3.61ff).

Even one of his wives is only permitted to visit him in the dark so that she will not realise who he really is (although this in the end is his undoing as she is instructed by her father to feel for his ears, the lack of which proves he is the Magus and not Cambyses' brother). Much is made of the fact that because she cannot see him, she does not know who he is (οὔτε γὰρ τὸν Κύρου Σμέρδιν ἰδέσθαι οὐδαμὰ οὔτε ὅστις εἴη ὁ συνοικέων αὐτῇ εἰδέναι – 3.68.4) – the triple negative here underlines the point. By denying his court and subjects the opportunity to see him and therefore to realise who he truly is, the Magus succeeds in holding on to power for seven months.

The Median king Deioces uses similar tactics, retreating inside the stronghold of Ecbatana and communicating with his court only by messengers in order to create a sense of mystery around his kingship (1.99). Deioces had previously been an ordinary citizen who came to prominence as a judge renowned for the fairness of his decisions. Herodotus comments that he hid himself away because he feared his fellow men would realise that as king he remained just an ordinary man like them, which might give them rebellious ideas: 'on the other hand if they could not see him they might think he had changed' (ἀλλ᾽ ἑτεροῖός σφι δοκέοι εἶναι μὴ ὁρῶσι – 1.99.2). Thus Deioces provides another example of control of *opsis* being used as a form of absolute power.[69]

[69] See Dewald (2003) 27-8 on Deioces. See Asheri (2007) 150-1 for discussion of this passage in the context of Eastern monarchy. He points out that 'the inaccessibility of the king was an important element in Persian etiquette'. Purves (2010) 139 notes that Deioces 'maintains the structure of his

Given the power that can be exercised through denying someone *opsis*, such denial can be used effectively to deceive. When Battus and his fellow Therans go on a colonising expedition to Libya, the Libyans persuade them to move location and lead them to the chosen spot at night so that they will not see the particularly beautiful place (Irasa) they are passing through (ἵνα διεξιόντες οἱ Ἕλληνες μὴ ἴδοιεν – 4.158.2). The lack of *opsis* can also have disastrous consequences, as when the Ephesians kill the Chians crossing their territory on the way home from the battle of Lade; in the darkness they think the Chians are bandits come to carry off their women who are busy celebrating the Thesmophoria (6.16).[70]

Lack of *opsis* as being linked to a lack of knowledge and the mystery that surrounds the unseen (as exemplified by the passages discussed above) recall many of the themes in the metanarrative involving *opsis*. We have already explored in depth in Chapters 2 and 3 how Herodotus credits *opsis* as the most trustworthy source for his enquiry because it provides the most secure path to knowledge; the inverse of this is that in his geographical excursuses the most mysterious regions about which least is known (such as the far North) or those about which the most fantastical stories are told (such as the gold-digging ants in India – 3.102-5) are those which he has not seen. For example, Herodotus states that no one knows what is beyond the Issedones because he could not find anyone who had seen this area for themselves and therefore knows about it: οὐδεὶς οἶδε ... οὐδενὸς γὰρ δὴ αὐτόπτεω εἰδέναι φαμένου δύναμαι πυθέσθαι (4.16.1). The parallel in the narrative is that to deny someone *opsis* is to deny them knowledge and thus to control or manipulate them in some way.

5.5: Correct Interpretations of *Opsis*

A few of the characters in the narrative stand out for their unusual ability to interpret the evidence of *opsis* correctly. Preeminent among these is of course

---

power precisely via the careful control of visual access'; Steiner (1994) 130-2 also notes that this is part of Deioces' method of control alongside his use of writing rather than speech as the main form of communication with his subjects. See also Gray (1996) 365 and (1997) 140-2 for a discussion of the similarities between Deioces' rise to power and that of Peisistratus.

[70] Hornblower and Pelling (2017) 104 however suggest this may have been a convenient excuse for the killing of fellow Greeks who were loyal to the Greek cause (the Ephesians did not participate in the battle of Lade).

Solon who has often been described as an internal Herodotus.[71] Famously, Solon visits Croesus in Sardis and is given the full tour of the fabulous Lydian treasuries, but remains unmoved by the sight of such great wealth. Much to Croesus' disgust, on being invited to name his Lydian host as the most fortunate man he has come across, Solon refuses to do so, explaining in a long moralising passage that one can only call a man fortunate at the end of his life if by that point he remains untouched by divine envy of mortal prosperity (1.29-33). That Croesus expects Solon to make a connection between the sight of his great wealth and good fortune is indicated by his (repeated) question as to whom Solon has 'seen' to be the most fortunate (εἶδες – 1.30.2; ἴδοι – 1.31.1).[72]

Solon is introduced to us as being one of the wisest men ('famous for his wisdom' – λόγος ... σοφίης εἵνεκεν (1.30.2) in Croesus' words) and so while he sees (θεησάμενον – 1.30.2) the great treasures, his interpretation is not that Croesus is the most fortunate (ὀλβιώτατον); rather, he recognises that good fortune cannot be measured by looking at one moment of happiness or prosperity in human life, but only at the balance of good and bad on death.[73]

It is interesting that while Solon's viewing of the treasury is described using words which have connotations of wonder or amazement (θεησάμενον) and the miraculous (φαίνεαι – 1.32.5),[74] when explaining his philosophy the word for seeing used by and about him is the more literal ὀρᾶν or σκοπέειν, culminating in the phrase that sums up that philosophy: σκοπέειν δὲ χρὴ παντὸς χρήματος τὴν τελευτὴν or τὴν τελευτὴν παντὸς χρήματος ὀρᾶν (1.33) – 'it is necessary to look to

[71] See, for example, Montiglio (2005) 133; Redfield (1985) 102; Friedman (2006) 167 in particular on θεωρία; Noussia-Fantuzzi (2010) 14 on the ways in which Solon's philosophy as presented in the *Histories*, but also as evidenced by the surviving fragments of his poetry, resonates with Herodotus' own world view; the grounding of the Herodotean account of Solon's philosophy in Solon's poetry is also recognised by Chiasson (1986). For a slightly different approach see Shapiro (1996), Harrison (2000a) 31-63 and Pelling (2006a) 143 n.6 who suggest the parallel is to be found in their similar moral agendas. For Herodotus' use of 'self-referential' characters, see Branscome (2013) 17, following Munson (2001). More generally on Solon and his poetry, see Irwin (2005).

[72] That Solon recognised the moral dangers inherent in great wealth is reflected in his poetry – obsession with the acquisition of wealth led to injustice and disorder: see Mitchell (1997) 138; Noussia-Fantuzzi (2010) 14, 17.

[73] See Ker (2000) for the link between this Solonian maxim, his *theoria* and role as legislator.

[74] Branscome (2015) 252 suggests that such language is used to underline Croesus' expectation that his guest will be impressed by the sight of this great wealth and experience a sense of wonder.

the end of everything'.[75] This becomes one of the key motifs of the *Histories*, the cycle (and inherent instability) of human fortune which is exemplified again and again by the rise and fall of great men and empires alike.[76] Solon is not overawed by the vision of Croesus' great wealth, but rather correctly interprets the gold he sees as merely the transient riches of a man, the continuance of whose current prosperity cannot be guaranteed.[77]

Branscome has argued that the failure of Solon to convince Croesus that good fortune is not guaranteed by material wealth is in part a device by Herodotus to show that truth is not always the best tool of persuasion (just as he will later criticise Aristagoras for being too honest with the Spartan king Cleomenes about the distance from the Ionian coast to Susa – 5.50.2). Solon fails in his attempt to teach Croesus the lesson of his historiographical stories about Tellus, and Cleobis and Biton[78] – Croesus merely concludes his illustrious guest is in fact 'of no account' (οὔτε λόγου μιν ... οὐδενὸς) and 'very stupid' (κάρτα ... ἀμαθέα) (1.33) – and thus Herodotus distinguishes himself from his 'rival enquirer' Solon who does not take into account the nature of his audience, i.e., that Croesus has no interest in hearing the truth. This forms part of Branscome's broader thesis that Herodotus sets up a number of rival enquirers throughout the *Histories* in order to demonstrate his own superiority as an enquirer by highlighting their failures and thus distinguishing himself from them. [79]

However, there is no indication in the text that the primary purpose of Solon's historiographical narrative is to persuade Croesus of his way of thinking. Croesus

---

[75] Herodotus' repeated comment that a certain individual was 'destined to come to a bad end' then becomes an echo of this Solonian maxim (χρῆν γενέσθαι κακῶς – see e.g., 1.8.2, 2.161.3, 4.79.1, 6.135.3, 9.109.2 and similarly 2.133.3, 3.43.1, 4.205, 5.33.2, 6.64).

[76] See Harrison (2000a) 43-52 for discussion on the repetition of this Solonian motif throughout the narrative.

[77] For the ways in which Herodotus shapes and subverts his audience's expectations of the meeting between Croesus and Solon, see Branscome (2015). See Wallace (2016) for the dating of Croesus' reign with reference to the meeting with Solon.

[78] See in particular Chiasson (2005) for detailed discussion of the Cleobis and Biton story in the context of Greek myth and religious ritual.

[79] Branscome (2013) 25-6, 30, 53. However, it is also important to recognise the role such figures play as prototypes for Herodotus: they have a didactic purpose in showing his audience how to conduct a robust investigation – to be discussed later in this chapter.

has asked his opinion and Solon gives it, without regard to the answer he surely knows Croesus is expecting; as a 'wise man' he does not let the vision of gold in Croesus' treasury affect his philosophy on human fortune, a philosophy he simply shares with Croesus on request. Therefore Solon's adherence to truth and correct interpretation of *opsis* in fact brings him closer to, rather than distinguishes him from, Herodotus.[80]

Another successful interpreter of *opsis* is the Spartan Lichas who helped Sparta win its war against Tegea by locating the bones of Orestes which the Delphic oracle declared the Spartans must repatriate if they wanted to defeat the Tegeans. In typical riddling language the oracle had indicated that the bones were to be found 'where strong necessity drives the blasts of the two winds, where there is blow and counter-blow, grief laid upon grief' (ἔνθ᾽ ἄνεμοι πνείουσι δύω κρατερῆς ὑπ᾽ ἀνάγκης, καὶ τύπος ἀντίτυπῳ, καὶ πῆμ᾽ ἐπὶ πήματι κεῖται – 1.67.4).

While travelling in Tegea, Lichas comes across a forge and watches a blacksmith at this work (ἐθηεῖτο ... ὀρέων ... ὀρέων – 1.68.1, 4). On engaging him in conversation, the blacksmith tells Lichas that he once came across a coffin while digging in his yard and saw bones of superhuman size inside (the blacksmith's autopsy is emphasised here: εἶδες ... εἶδον ... ὁπώπεε – 1.68.2-3).[81] Lichas puts together what he has seen of the blacksmith's work with the blacksmith's eyewitness account of the bones and realises that he has found Orestes' remains: the 'winds' and 'blows' referred to by the oracle are the blacksmith's bellows, hammer and anvil, while the 'grief' is the beating of the iron.[82]

Interestingly, the Spartans do not believe Lichas when he recounts these events (ἔφραζε – 1.68.5) and banish him on a false charge; only when he has brought the

[80] Another connection between Solon and Herodotus in this context is the way in which Solon refers to physical, visible evidence for the stories he narrates – the tomb of Tellus (1.30.5) and the statues of Cleobis and Biton at Delphi (1.31.5) – thus suggesting that these stories can be verified by *opsis*. Branscome (2013) 38-9, 43 does in fact recognise this link, comparing Solon's implied reference to autopsy of physical monuments to Herodotus' mention of the dolphin statue at the end of the Arion narrative (1.23-4).

[81] Huxley (1979) argues that the bones were in fact found in Oresthasion or Oresteion (within Tegean territory in the mid-sixth century BC) rather than in Tegea itself as Herodotus claims.

[82] Gray (1997) 144 sees a parallel between Lichas' successful interpretation of the blacksmith's autopsy and Periander's equally successful decipherment of his herald's account of watching Thrasybulus cut off the ears of the tallest sheaves of corn (5.92).

bones back to Sparta (and presumably the Spartans have seen them) is his story and explanation accepted.[83] Kearns has explored the importance in the culture of the Greek *polis* of having a 'saviour' (σωτήρ), whether that be a god, hero or perhaps leading citizen (male or female) who makes a great personal sacrifice (usually by giving up his or her life) and thus becomes 'immortalised', to bring about the deliverance of the city from threats or impending disasters.[84]

In this context, the transfer of a hero's bones from one location to another has huge symbolic significance, as it represents the transfer of that hero's protection to the new city – as Kearns points out, the transfer of Orestes' bones to Sparta has as much to do with removing that protection from the Tegeans as it does with bringing it to the Spartans.[85] Higbie even suggests that the effort required by Sparta to locate and repatriate the bones implies that the Tegeans made efforts to keep their whereabouts hidden.[86]

After the 'return' of Orestes, the Spartans go on to win the war against Tegea (1.68.6). Thus the appropriation of Orestes' bones clearly had political ramifications. McCauley has suggested that it represented the Spartans trying to establish a connection with the royal dynasty of Mycenae and thus their claim to hegemony over the Peloponnese, yet it can also be seen, at least in part, as a conciliatory gesture, the recognition of a joint inheritance with the Tegeans to the Achaean past leading to the peace treaty which ends the war.[87] However, other

[83] The location of a local (usually the founding) hero's bones was often an important part of cult in Greek city states, although as in this case and, for example, with the return of Theseus' bones from Skyros to Athens by Kimon in the fifth century BC (for which see Zaccarini (2015)), repatriation of such bones not infrequently occurred much later in the life of the city. See de Polignac (1995) 143-9 and McCauley (1999) (who has identified thirteen examples of hero bone transfer) for discussion of this tradition.

[84] Pausanias (*Periegesis*, 3.11.10) saw the tomb of Orestes in the agora during his visit to Sparta which implies the existence of a local cult.

[85] Kearns (1990), in particular 326-8 for hero cult as a vital part of ensuring the safety of the city.

[86] Higbie (1997) 296-7. The protection afforded by the physical presence of the hero was highly prized as was the implied connection between the heroic past and the city. See Higbie (1997) more generally for the role of this kind of cultural anthropology in the use and ownership of the past in Greek culture.

[87] McCauley (1999) 88-90: as Dorians, the Spartans were relative newcomers to the region as opposed to the Tegans who were descended from the pre-Dorian rulers of the Peloponnese. Thus the Spartans needed to establish their legitimacy to be the leaders of the region and control Tegean

scholars such as Phillips have disputed that there were any friendly motivations in Sparta's removal of Orestes' bones; the act was simply another indication of Sparta's determination to dominate the Peloponnese, just as Orestes had done.[88]

The significance of Orestes' bones also lies in their tangible nature; they provide observable evidence of the hero's presence and his return. McCauley believes that this is in fact the most significant feature of the transfer of bones in Greek hero cult: 'the bones are important because they are the only physical, tangible proof possible of the hero's presence. To have the hero's bones is the most convincing way to show everyone that the hero himself is present'.[89] Thus the exercise of *opsis* is intimately connected with the transfer of a hero's bones which is reflected in the manner of Lichas' discovery.

Lichas interprets the evidence of *opsis*, both his own and that of another eyewitness, to reach an accurate identification of the bones which (Herodotus tells us) is at least in part a result of his intelligence (σοφίῃ – 1.68.1). By contrast, the Spartans who have not had the benefit of autopsy and are hearing the blacksmith's eyewitness account at second hand (through Lichas) are not persuaded that the bones are indeed those of Orestes, again exemplifying the Herodotean maxim that men believe their eyes more than their ears. In this sense, like Solon, Lichas can be viewed as another internal Herodotus in that he is able to decode the true meaning of what he has seen to reach a conclusion about certain events or (in Solon's case) a general truth about the nature of man.

Boedeker has argued that the Lichas story shows Herodotus trying to draw a contrast between the Spartans and the Athenians, who a few chapters earlier in

---

foreign policy. Yet by allowing the Spartans to recognise a shared Achaean past, the Tegeans found a way out of a war which was going badly for them without losing their freedom. Huxley (1979) agrees that the appropriation of the bones was about legitimising Spartan dominance of the Peloponnese. Clark (2012) 69 suggests that the incident was so effective because it could be subject to a range of different interpretations.

[88] Phillips (2003) 305-6, 310. He points to incidents such as the expulsion of Aeschines of Sicyon and the removal of Teisamenus' (son of Orestes) bones from Helice in Achaea (after the return of Orestes' bones) as further evidence that this act did not mark a shift in Spartan foreign policy of being any friendlier towards the pre-Dorians, but rather a continuation and expansion of Spartan attempts to establish a hegemony over the Peloponnese which ultimately resulted in the Peloponnesian League (306-8, 310-11).

[89] McCauley (1999) 94-5.

Book 1 welcomed back the tyrant Peisistratus in the extraordinary episode where 'Athena' leads him into the city (1.60 – discussed above). These events are narrated by Herodotus in the context of Croesus trying to decide which of the two cities, Athens or Sparta, would make a better ally. As the Spartan success against Tegea has been sanctioned by the Delphic oracle, whereas the Peisistratid regime only has pseudo-divine support in the form of a false Athena, Herodotus demonstrates that Sparta with its *eunomia*, as opposed to Athens under a tyranny and riven by infighting (ἐν τῇ μάχῃ – 1.64.3), is the better ally for Croesus.[90]

A similar contrast could be drawn in terms of *opsis*: the return of Orestes to Sparta was based on Lichas' accurate deductions from the evidence of *opsis* and (as implied by Herodotus' narrative) the insistence by his fellow Spartans that they should see the bones for themselves. Peisistratus' return to Athens, meanwhile, is based on a visual deception, the Athenians incorrectly interpreting the sight of Peisistratus being led into the city by 'Athena' as the goddess sanctioning his return. Thus a 'true' return is contrasted with a 'false' one.

As noted previously, characters in the narrative who interpret or use *opsis* successfully are often those who insist on seeing things for themselves (autopsy) and this value placed on visual proof by characters in the narrative mirrors the pre-eminent position of *opsis* as a source in the metanarrative. There are several examples in the text of characters who have to see something for themselves before they will believe it to be true or where an eyewitness account lends credence to a narrative.

Zopyrus, one of the seven conspirators who deposed the Magus Smerdis, is told that one of his pack mules has given birth, partially fulfilling the Babylonian saying that Babylon would fall when one of the mules gave birth. But he does not believe the messenger until he has seen the mule himself: ὡς δέ οἱ ἐξαγγέλθη καὶ ὑπὸ ἀπιστίης αὐτὸς ὁ Ζώπυρος εἶδε τὸ βρέφος ('Zopyrus did not believe it when he was told, but had to see the baby mule for himself' – 3.153.1).

[90] Boedeker (1993) 172-3: Athenian success and stability will arrive only after the tyranny and the establishment of *isonomia*. See also Asheri (2007) 129: in Herodotus' view, the return of Orestes' bones to Sparta was the origin of Spartan superiority in the Peloponnese, which is why Croesus chose Sparta as his ally.

At the meeting before the battle of Salamis, Aristides' view of the seriousness of the Greeks' plight in the face of the Persian invasion is increased because he has seen for himself that the Greek fleet is surrounded by the Persian: ἐγὼ γὰρ αὐτόπτης τοι λέγω γενόμενος ('for I speak as one who has seen for myself' – 8.79.4), a phrase which is repeated back to him by Themistocles, emphasising the importance of this eyewitness account. The fact that the Greek commanders do not believe Aristides' report merely underlines the importance of seeing for oneself in order to believe that something is true.

During the Persian invasion of Scythia, Gobryas, one of the other seven conspirators against the Magus Smerdis, tells Darius that he had a good idea of how hard it would be to defeat the Scythians from hearing about them, but having come to Scythia and seen their tactics he is even more convinced of the impossibility of defeating them: ἐγὼ σχεδὸν μὲν καὶ λόγῳ ἠπιστάμην τούτων τῶν ἀνδρῶν τὴν ἀπορίην, ἐλθὼν δὲ μᾶλλον ἐξέμαθον, ὁρων αὐτοὺς ἐμπαίζοντας ἡμῖν (4.134.2). Here the contrast made with an oral report (and the μὲν ... δὲ phrase) serves to underline the supremacy of *opsis* over *akoe* and its role in bringing knowledge (Gobryas has 'learnt more' by watching the Scythians' antics).

In Book 2, the Egyptian pharaoh Proteus offers a significant display of investigative methods based on autopsy. In recounting how the Trojan Alexander (Paris) and Helen came to Egypt, Herodotus notes that they stopped off at the Canobic mouth of the Nile on their way to Troy where their servants claimed sanctuary at the temple of Heracles, alleging that Alexander had stolen Helen, the wife of his host in Sparta, Menelaus. A report of this allegation is sent by the local officer (Thonis) to Proteus in Memphis, asking him how he should act. However, Proteus insists that Alexander be sent to him at Memphis because he wants to see the situation for himself and hear the evidence before forming a judgement: ἵνα εἰδέω τι κοτὲ καὶ λέξει (lit: 'so that I can see what he has to say for himself' – 2.114.3) – a rather unusual use of *opsis*, implying as it does that Proteus wants to 'see' Alexander's account of his actions. Perhaps Proteus means that he can better judge Alexander's

character and the truth of his story if he sees him in person.[91] Proteus observes and hears the accounts of both Alexander and his servants before coming to a judgement (2.113-5).

Not only does Proteus insist upon seeing the evidence for himself, but he also weighs up different accounts of the same events in order to reach a conclusion about their truth. These methods are familiar from Herodotus' own enquiry and De Bakker has argued that this similarity is deliberate: 'to show how valuable his enquiring methods are, [Herodotus] weaves them into the story of a king who displays a similar empirical method. The staging of Proteus as an exemplary enquirer strengthens the persuasive power of Herodotus' own enquiry: both base their verdict on the events upon evidence that is brought within their view.'[92] De Jong also notes that Herodotus incorporates a piece of his own *opsis* into the Proteus story – that the temple of Heracles where the servants seek sanctuary is still standing in his own day – which further strengthens this link between Proteus and Herodotus.[93]

It is hardly surprising to discover that characters in the narrative place the same value on *opsis* as a source of trustworthy evidence and use similar methods of enquiry as does Herodotus as investigator – Herodotus is, after all, the narrator. But what makes certain individuals successful at interpreting or manipulating *opsis* while others struggle and fail? One cannot ignore the fact that, as illustrated in Chapter 4, as a narrative device Herodotus uses success or failure with *opsis* as a motif to signify more generally that a particular character is likely to prosper or is ultimately doomed. Yet those who interpret or use *opsis* successfully also stand out in other ways: the wisdom and travel of Solon and Lichas is explicitly noted; Zopyrus uses the power of *opsis* to deceive the Babylonians, but also insists on exercising his own autopsy before believing something to be true.

[91] On this episode, see in particular De Bakker (2012) 120-2 for discussion on how Herodotus uses Proteus to highlight that methods of enquiry, particularly the evidence of eyewitnesses, can be used to find out about past events.

[92] De Bakker (2012) 122; see also Grethlein (2010) 156 on these similarities.

[93] De Jong (2012a).

More generally, characters such as Proteus and Periander seem determined to get at the truth of a matter: their enquiries are fuelled by a desire for knowledge. Periander is another tyrant who employs Herodotean investigative methods when trying to discover the truth of Arion's story that he was thrown overboard by sailors who were supposed to be transporting him to Corinth, but was rescued by a dolphin (1.24). Periander insists on interrogating the sailors as well as Arion before reaching a judgment[94] – the word ἱστορέεσθαι to describe his questioning of the sailors (a verb which appears only seventeen times in the text) recalls Herodotus' description of his own work as an *historie* in the proem.[95] Furthermore, some scholars have noted that the appearance of Arion in front of the sailors shows Periander deploying visual proof in the same manner as Herodotus (who provides his own visual evidence of the story in the form of the bronze statue of a man riding a dolphin dedicated at Taenarum (1.24.8)).[96]

Both Herodotus and the author of the *Athenaion Politeia* (11.1) described Solon's travels as fuelled by θεωρία, a desire for seeing the world and therefore knowledge.[97] Rutherford suggests that this meaning of θεωρία has a sense of 'philosophical contemplation' and a curiosity about the world, which is not entirely unconnected with its religious meaning of pilgrimage.[98] This desire for "truth" or knowledge about a matter is closely mirrored by Herodotus' own enquiry as he weighs up different accounts, seeks alternative sources for events and looks for

[94] Salmon (1984) 197 highlights the Arion episode as evidence of Periander's more reasonable side, contrary to his usual image as the cruel tyrant (see *Histories*, 5.92).

[95] Interestingly, Periander is one of the very few characters in the *Histories* who correctly interprets the evidence of another eyewitness when he works out the meaning of Thrasybulus' actions in cutting off the heads of the tallest ears of grain in a field as described to him by a messenger (*Histories*, 5.92) – discussed above.

[96] See Branscome (2015) 245 n.48 following Gray (2001) 16. Gray (2001) 12 also highlights the bronze statue as an indication of Herodotus' autopsy.

[97] See Rutherford (2013) for a detailed exploration of θεωρία in a religious context, i.e., pilgrimage, the emergence of which was brought about by the establishment of the Greek city-state and the development of major inter-state sanctuaries (37-8). Ker (2000) discusses the meaning of θεωρία in the context of Solon's travels; see also Rhodes (1993) 169-70 on the possible extent of Solon's travels.

[98] Rutherford (2013) 149. In the meaning of 'sight-seeing' θεωρία also encompasses pilgrimage of a different kind, a 'yearning for an unusual and memorable visual experience' (155) rather than a religious one, although it may be related to religious pilgrimage to the extent that the sightseer visits sanctuaries or temples.

physical visual evidence of the past. In this regard, many of the characters discussed here represent aspects of his investigative method, becoming internal versions of Herodotus, and thus providing a more subtle way for him to promote his methods of enquiry to his audience.

5.6: The Commemorative Function of *Opsis*

Alongside characters who use and interpret *opsis* correctly are those who recognise the powerful impact of the visual and therefore use tangible memorials of themselves or their deeds in order to perpetuate their memory in future generations.[99] There is a direct link with Herodotus the investigator as he often uses those memorials as evidence for his enquiry.[100] Many of these memorials (such as the iron spits dedicated by Rhodopis at Delphi (2.135) or the victory dedications made by the Greeks at the Isthmus and Delphi after the battle of Salamis (8.121-2)) have already been discussed at length in Chapters 2 and 3, where Herodotus' use of *opsis* in the metanarrative was explored, so here only a few examples will be examined.

Visual memorials played an important role in Greek culture in recording significant events and therefore shaping, glorifying and perpetuating the history of a community. It was common practice to set up a trophy after military victories, both a panoply at the point at which the enemy had fled and victory dedications in temples.[101] This is especially true of the memorials set up during the Persian War to commemorate the Greek victories over the Persians.

---

[99] For an interesting discussion of the use of monuments to create and perpetuate narrative (and therefore memory) see Elsner (1994) particularly 230-4 on the Egyptian pyramids in the *Histories*. See also Lovatt (2013) for the way in which an epic hero's memory must be perpetuated by a physical monument (most obviously, his tomb and armour); Steiner (1994) 128-35 on the use of physical memorials and inscriptions by Oriental monarchs to claim ownership of territory – she notes that inscribed markers as memorials of individual achievement are only used by non-Greeks; Greek markers always memorialise the civic valour of the community as a whole; Bakker (2002) 26-7 on the desire of characters to leave a memorial of themselves.

[100] The difficulties involved in assessing the accuracy of memory is a key problem for the historian. See Morrison (2004), particularly 100-1, on Thucydides' approach to this issue. He suggests that Thucydides' written narrative was viewed by its author as a method of preserving memory (Thucydides' work is a κτῆμά τε ἐς αἰεὶ – *Peloponnesian War*, 1.22.4).

[101] See Steinbock (2013) 84-94 on this tradition and the ways in which the Athenians in particular used monuments and inscriptions to perpetuate collective memory. Physical monuments and

Price has articulated four contexts within which the Greeks constructed the past (or 'networks of memory' in Price's words): objects and representations; places; ritual behaviour (and associated myths); and textual narratives.[102] Although we are primarily concerned here with the first of these – objects and representations – in the case of temple dedications (which constitute the majority of historical objects which Herodotus sees) arguably the second context (places – the temple in question) and third context (ritual – the act of dedication) are also invoked. Thus one reason why temple dedications created such powerful memorials is that they spanned several of these different 'networks of memory' and appealed to the ways in which the Greeks thought about the past. Finally, by recording these visual memorials in his *historie*, Herodotus brings them into the fourth context, textual narrative.

Shear has explored the vital memorial function of Athenian funeral speeches (*epitaphioi*) of the fifth and fourth centuries BC in creating a collective memory of the Athenian war dead: every winter the Athenians gathered to mourn the men who had died in battle which involved burying their bones in the public cemetery and honouring them with a speech. The invocation of great deeds (ἔργα) of the ancestors, whether that be as far back as the Trojan War or the more recent fifth-century BC victories against the Persians, would often be invoked, creating a nexus between past and present; this placed the achievements of the recent dead in a long line of glorious deeds, but also demonstrated that the past (the dead) lived on in the present by being perpetuated in the memory of the living.[103]

Like Price, Shear recognises that physical monuments and ritual interact with narrative (in this case the funeral oration) to create memory, here the collective memory of the Athenians. In particular, public victory monuments played an important role in reinforcing the memories created by funeral orations, such as the bronze chariot commemorating the double victory over the Boeotians and

---

memorials were given further meaning by becoming the focal point for commemorative activities (85-6). The Athenian orators' frequent reference to public monuments evidences their importance in public discourse about collective memory (89-90). See also Low (2012).

[102] Price (2012) 17.

[103] Shear (2013). Funeral orations perpetuated the memory of the war dead and created a shared historical narrative to unify the citizens.

Chalcidians in 506 BC (*Histories*, 5.77.3-4) or the south frieze of the Nike Temple on the Acropolis which showed Greeks fighting Persians, probably at Marathon.[104] Moreover, monuments had a physical presence which endured long after the performance of an oration; as Steinbock puts it: 'since the personal recollections of eyewitnesses are always variegated and particularly prone to the distorting effects of memory, this durable visual representation played an important role in the creation of a more stable and uniform version of the event'.[105]

The Egyptian pharaoh Sesostris set up statues of himself, his wife and his four sons in front of the temple of Hephaestus at Memphis to commemorate his own achievements including his victory over the Scythians: μνημόσυνα δὲ ἐλίπετο πρὸ τοῦ Ἡφαιστείου ἀνδριάντας λιθίνους (2.110.1). Herodotus recounts an anecdote that later on when Darius wanted to set up a similar statue of himself in front of those of Sesostris and his family, the priest of Hephaestus refused saying that Darius' achievements (ἔργα) did not surpass those of Sesostris, in particular because he had failed to conquer the Scythians (2.110.2-3). Darius does, however, set up a statue of himself when he becomes King of Persia to mark his succession and Herodotus tells us that it was the first thing he did on coming to power (πρῶτον... – 3.88.3).

These episodes illustrate the concern of powerful men to leave a lasting visual memorial of their achievements. The fact that Darius wanted his statue to stand before that of Sesostris shows that Sesostris' attempt to perpetuate his memory had the desired effect. It also demonstrates that placing one's own image alongside, or even at an advantage to, those of great leaders of the past was important for promoting one's own power and image as a strong leader in the present day.[106]

---

[104] Shear (2013) 531-4 on the interaction between Athenian funeral orations and public monuments.

[105] Steinbock (2013) 89. However, he acknowledges that monuments are subject to interpretation by the viewer and that such interpretation can of course change over time (90).

[106] See Steiner (1994) 129-30 on this episode: 'It reveals the "archetypal" status of Sesostris in Herodotus' account, the standard both at home and abroad that other kings seek to match, and draws the dead monarch into the competitive building programmes that will obsess the subsequent rulers of Egypt and elsewhere' (130).

Of course Darius made other attempts to commemorate his (ultimately unsuccessful) Scythian expedition by setting up pillars to mark his route into Scythia, first by the Bosporus (4.87) and then by the River Tearus (4.91). His engineer, Mandrocles, who built the pontoon bridge over the Bosporus so that Darius' forces could cross into Europe, also commemorates (μνημόσυνα) his achievements by commissioning a painting of the bridge with Darius and his army crossing it and dedicating the painting in the temple of Hera on Samos (4.88).[107] Here we can see an attempt to mould the historical record, the pillars and the painting giving a rather different impression of Darius' Scythian expedition than the reality of its ultimate failure which in turn provides something of a warning to the historian who may be relying on such memorials as evidence of past events.[108] The fact that the Byzantines later removed the Bosporus pillars and used them for the altar of Artemis the Saviour (4.87.2) perhaps shows an attempt to expropriate this memory, if not remove it entirely: those who control the memorials of the past control the past itself.[109]

The setting up of a visual memorial, therefore, demonstrates a desire not just to control the way certain persons or events are perceived in the present, but also how they will be perceived and remembered in the future. A visual memorial is an immediate, tangible connection with the past – the setting up of a memorial is an act of looking to the future, while the viewing of it in later times is an act of looking

[107] Boedeker (1998) 192 notes the contrast between a memorial commemorating the achievements of an individual and a Greek memorial which would typically celebrate the achievements of the *polis*; Clarke (2018) 150 comments on the different viewpoints of Darius, Mandrocles and Herodotus.

[108] See West (2013) on the dedication of this painting by Mandrocles in the Heraion, suggesting that it was a key pictorial source for Herodotus' account of Darius' campaign; she accepts it was still there in Herodotus' day (119) and that he most likely had first-hand knowledge of Samos (120).

[109] See Grethlein (2009) 208-9 and (2013) 187-9 on these passages: the removal of the pillars by the Byzantines 'not only paradoxically expresses the short life span of Persia's claims to rule over Europe, but also illustrates failure to establish permanent memory' (188). Grethlein notes that the gap in reality between the purported successes that such monuments seek to commemorate and the actual outcome of Darius' campaigns underlines the importance of a teleological view of history; indeed, he argues that this demonstrates history can only be told retrospectively (198). By contrast, the *stele* commemorating the Samians who did not defect at the battle of Lade (6.14.3) was set up only after the battle and survived to Herodotus' day, as did the tripod set up at Delphi after Salamis (199). Steiner (1994) 133 notes that the dismantling of the monument is also symbolic of the destruction of Darius' hubris and ambition.

to the past with the memorial itself providing the bridge between the two.[110] As Steinbock points out, 'monuments are a special type of carrier of social memory, since they link past, present, and future through their very materiality'.[111]

There is a clear link here with the Homeric concept of κλέος and the perpetuation of a hero's fame. Lovatt has pointed out that in order to try to ensure the continuation of his memory, the hero must create a physical memorial of his deeds, even if this involves the paradox of his being transformed from an active agent to a passive object to be viewed by others: 'a monument is a visible sign which stimulates an act of remembering: unlike a souvenir, it carries with it authority and creates cultural capital'.[112] And as we have already seen, by setting up a memorial to his achievements, the hero or king can influence the way in which these achievements will be viewed and interpreted by future generations.

Price points to Herodotus' viewing of the three tripods inscribed with Kadmean (Phoenician) letters in the Temple of Ismenian Apollo at Thebes, which he takes as evidence that the Greek alphabet derives via Kadmos from Phoenicia (5.59), as illustrative of the Greek desire to understand the present by reference to the past.[113] This may be one reason why Herodotus places such emphasis on the use of *opsis* as a source for his enquiry into historical events, in particular his viewing of memorials and temple dedications, as physical remains provide a tangible link between past and present.

The pharaoh Pheros, having regained his eyesight after a period of temporary blindness inflicted by the gods in punishment for an act of sacrilege, dedicates numerous offerings in sanctuaries across Egypt including two obelisks in the temple of the sun at Heliopolis (2.111). There is clearly some poignancy in the setting up of such large visual memorials in thanksgiving for a cure from blindness in a temple of light, necessary for sight. Further, Herodotus describes these

[110] See Dignas and Smith (2012) 2 on the 'long-standing Greek desire to link the present to the remote past' in the context of Greek attitudes to memory; they note that objects such as monuments and temple dedications are 'of high significance to this task'.

[111] Steinbock (2013) 84.

[112] Lovatt (2013) 346, 357-64.

[113] Price (2012) 19.

obelisks as ἀξιοθέητα ... ἔργα (2.111.4) which both underlines their visual impact and provides the connection between past and present. Temple dedications are of course a particularly effective way of perpetuating memory because of the role of temples as permanent religious centres over time and (in some cases) their cross-cultural role given that visitors from many regions pass through them.[114]

Thus visual memorials provide another example of the power of *opsis* in that they are used to perpetuate the memory of individuals or events beyond their lifespan. Just as in their use of *opsis* certain characters have been shown to represent internal versions of Herodotus as investigator, so Herodotus' use of visual memorials for his enquiry reveals him responding to the opportunities left by those characters to exercise his autopsy, thus providing another link between past and present, between narrative and metanarrative.

5.7: Narrative and Metanarrative: A Coherent Picture of *Opsis*?

Chapters 4 and 5 have provided two contrasting representations of *opsis* in the narrative of the *Histories*. In Chapter 4, the inability of certain characters to use *opsis* effectively and to interpret visual evidence (in particular dreams) was explored, as were the dangers of both relying on another's *opsis* and indulging in an excessive desire to see. This chapter, on the other hand, has examined those characters who successfully manipulate *opsis* to their own advantage by using it to deceive others or to create effective propaganda, perpetuate their memory by leaving visual memorials or demonstrate a mastery of *opsis* by correctly interpreting it and refusing to rely on the eyewitness of others.

A few initial conclusions can be drawn from a comparison between these two portrayals of *opsis* in the narrative: relying on another's *opsis* is nearly always disastrous and one should exercise autopsy whenever possible; a desire to see is healthy but only if inspired by the right motives – a thirst for knowledge about the world, not a hubristic ἔρως; the visual is a hugely powerful medium, mastery of which provides clear benefits.

[114] See Kosmetatou (2013) for Herodotus' use of temple inventories and dedications at Delphi.

Yet the portrayal of *opsis* in the narrative also produces some paradoxes and complications. The mistakes of Harpagus and Polycrates clearly demonstrate the evidential value of autopsy, but there are plenty of characters who do see for themselves yet fail to interpret correctly what they see. If autopsy is so important, why do characters such as Xerxes who demonstrate a great passion for seeing come to such bad ends? Ultimately the fact that 'men trust their eyes more than their ears' means that visual deceptions are all the more effective, arguably raising questions about the value of visual phenomena as an accurate source.

This in turn creates a tension with the metanarrative. Herodotus' use of *opsis* for his enquiry as explored in Chapters 2 and 3 reveals a clear picture of *opsis* as a key source and one which provides a more reliable path to knowledge than *akoe*/oral sources. The narrative, however, complicates this picture because it shows that one cannot always accept visual evidence at face value – it is easy to misinterpret without the right interpretative skills or investigative approach.

Naturally it is important to remember that Herodotus' use of *opsis* serves at least in part as a narrative device, allowing the narrator to signify the future success or failure of a particular character. For example Xerxes, who demonstrates perhaps the least affinity with *opsis* (his inability to interpret dreams; his hubristic desire to watch his troops; his failures with visual propaganda) suffers the greatest downfall – the defeat of his entire army and fleet by the Greek forces, the narrative of which provides the climax of the *Histories*. Likewise, Cyrus' failure to understand the true meaning of his dream about Darius marks the moment when his defeat and death become inevitable.

On the other hand, Peisistratus' return to power in Athens is founded on a successful visual deception, while it is no surprise to find that Zopyrus, who insists on autopsy, also knows how to use *opsis* to his advantage, bringing about the fall of Babylon for which he is greatly rewarded by Darius. *Opsis* is, therefore, one (among many) narrative motifs which fits into the 'cycle of fate' theme – made all the more effective due to the way in which the power of *opsis* is evidenced again and again throughout the work.

Is there then an argument that *opsis* in the narrative should be viewed merely as a narrative device, unconnected with its use by Herodotus for his enquiry? The

problem with such an approach is that the Herodotean narrative and metanarrative together form too sophisticated and nuanced a text to allow such (apparent) inconsistencies between the misinterpretation of *opsis* by characters in the narrative and the emphasis placed on it as a trustworthy source in the metanarrative. Indeed, arguably Herodotus intends his audience to notice this tension.

The didactic nature of the *Histories* and the fact that a key feature of the metanarrative is that Herodotus is trying to show his audience how to conduct a successful investigation have already been commented on in Chapter 3. At least one purpose of the work is for the author to present and promote his methods of enquiry to the world – that is, after all, the impetus behind the very first sentence: Ἡροδότου Ἁλικαρνησσέος ἱστορίης ἀπόδεξις ἥδε.[115]

Pelling has highlighted the way in which Herodotus uses the Croesus and Solon meeting at the beginning of the work not just to introduce his audience to the theme of 'fruitless warners and heedless learners' but also to teach them about 'the whole enterprise of historiography itself': in other words, the difficulties of creating a robust method of enquiry and of deciding what (if anything) we can learn from history.[116] Croesus has all the benefits of Solon's experience and wisdom to draw upon in his enquiry into the identity of the most fortunate man on earth, but he is blinded by the glitter of his own wealth from learning anything from this insight.

---

[115] Many scholars have noted the didactic nature of the text. See, for example, Dewald (1993) 68 on Herodotus encouraging the audience to read and interpret objects in the text themselves; Munson (2001) 4 on the *Histories*' lesson of looking to the past to understand the present and future; Raaflaub (2002) 181 on didactic similarities with epic; Welser (2009) on the didactic nature of the end of the *Histories* ('encouraging the reader to look for the completion of Herodotean historical patterns in events subsequent to those in Herodotus' text' – 361), with a bibliography on this topic; Branscome (2013) for Herodotus' use of internal enquirers to teach his audience how to present the results of *historie* effectively; Irwin (2014) 70 on Herodotus' requirement that his readers engage in their own *historie* to fully appreciate his work.

[116] Pelling (2006a) 146: 'Learning from experience, one's own or others', is a most delicate business, and communicating that learning is more difficult still: this scene may also suggest the limitations that attend any project of grasping and communicating insight, the limitations within which Herodotus' own text and readers, no less than his characters, have to operate'. This neatly illustrates the interconnectivity between narrative and metanarrative as regards the use and interpretation of sources for *historie*.

Branscome has explored how Herodotus uses the text 'to engage in an implicit metaliterary conversation with his readers on the difficulties inherent in an enquirer's presenting the products of his research to his audience'. For Branscome, Herodotus does this by using characters in the text to act as 'rival inquirers' engaging in historiographic and/or ethnographic enquiries similar to his own and presenting the results to internal audiences, activities which he can then critique to show his audience that his own methods as an enquirer are superior.[117]

Herodotus' style of writing often indicates an expectation of active participation from his audience, and in this context the oral nature of the text should be remembered – presumably Herodotus' public readings of his work would have involved lively engagement with his audience. This is reflected both in the often polemical tone of the *Histories* and the way in which Herodotus sometimes leaves a question open for his audience to make up their own minds.[118] Thus he may present two or more versions of the same story and allow his audience to decide which version to believe, encouraging them to practise *historie* themselves.[119]

For example, at 5.45 Herodotus reports that there are two different versions of the story of the capture of Sybaris by the Crotonians: the Sybarites claim the Crotonians had help from Dorieus, while the Crotonians say only the diviner Callias of Elis assisted them. Herodotus cites the supporting evidence for both versions, but leaves his audience to decide which is true: 'So this is the evidence produced by either side; anyone can agree with whichever of the two accounts he finds plausible' (ταῦτα μέν νυν ἑκάτεροι αὐτῶν μαρτύρια ἀποφαίνονται, καὶ πάρεστι, ὁκοτέροισί τις πείθεται αὐτῶν, τούτοισι προσχωρέειν – 5.45.2).[120]

---

[117] Branscome (2013) 2-3; this theory was discussed earlier in the chapter in relation to Solon. One might compare this with the way in which characters in the narrative frequently manipulate different versions of the past for their own ends which, as Boedeker (2012) 33-4 has noted, allows Herodotus to present their accounts of past events as less trustworthy than his narrative; see also Baragwanath (2012) making a similar point (albeit more limited in scope) in relation to the use of myth; and Grethlein (2010) 173-87 on the use and abuse of the past in speeches in the *Histories*.

[118] Baragwanath (2008) 2 has noted that Herodotus' frequent inclusion of different versions of, or explanations for, events explicitly invites his audience to engage in the act of interpreting evidence and to reach their own conclusions.

[119] On this technique and on direct addresses to the audience in the second person, see Munson (2001) 37: Herodotus co-opts his audience into his enquiry.

[120] See also *Histories*, 2.123 for a similar approach.

The severe consequences of relying on another's *opsis* rather than insisting on autopsy, as suffered by Harpagus and Polycrates, may be viewed as Herodotus attempting to drive home to his audience the importance both of personal eyewitness as a path to knowledge about events and of questioning the eyewitness accounts of others.[121] So when considering the didactic nature of the text, the inability of certain characters to interpret *opsis* correctly becomes less problematic. Those characters who fail to interpret *opsis* successfully, such as Croesus or Xerxes, could be said to be flawed in some way, usually because of a hubristic tendency: a thirst for power (Cyrus, Astyages, Xerxes); an arrogant belief that social customs or the vagaries of fate do not apply to them (Croesus, Candaules, Polycrates); or disrespect shown to the gods (Cambyses).[122] This may be contrasted with Herodotus, whose investigative methods are inspired by his thirst for knowledge about the world and who exercises his own autopsy wherever possible to advance his enquiry.[123]

The role of *opsis* in the narrative therefore may at least in part be to illustrate the interpretative problems attached to using *opsis* as a source when engaging in *historie*, while the metanarrative serves as a prototype of how do to this successfully. So what is the key to interpreting visual evidence successfully? Herodotus can be relied upon, as ever, to provide some clues. There are at least a couple of instances in the text where he appears explicitly to criticise those who interpret *opsis* unthinkingly. As was discussed earlier in this chapter, Herodotus expresses surprise that the Athenians were taken in by the sight of Peisistratus being brought back to Athens by 'Athena' given they are supposed to be the most intelligent of the Greeks (1.60). In fact, Herodotus describes the deception with Phye and the chariot as 'by far the most simple-minded thing I have ever come

[121] Asheri (2007) 508 comments on Polycrates: 'The stratagem of Oroetes delighted Herodotus, who also wished to underline the dangers of naive credulity'.

[122] See Pelling (1997a) 63 on end of Book 9 and the Persians having been seduced by a life of luxury in contravention of Cyrus' words of wisdom on plain living: 'wisdom and insight ... carry you only so far. Even though the Persians could see the dangers, they could not resist a fancy pair of trousers and a nice glass of wine'.

[123] Dewald (1985), (1993) and (1997) highlights Herodotus' use of personal enquiry as regards tangible evidence.

across' (πρῆγμα εὐηθέστατον, ὡς ἐγὼ εὑρίσκω, μακρῷ – 1.60.3) thus underlining the credulity of the Athenians.

Similarly, during the battle of Plataea, Artabazus and his 40,000 troops who are coming to assist their fellow Persians in the battle turn round and flee when they see that the Persians are losing, prompting Herodotus to comment: 'it is clear to me that the success or failure of the invasion depended entirely on the Persians themselves. After all, on the occasion in question, Artabazus and his men fled before they had even joined battle, simply because they saw that the Persians had been pushed back' (9.68.1).[124] Although this may also be a comment on the Persians' lack of courage, both of these episodes serve as a reminder that a certain degree of intelligence or common sense needs to be exercised when interpreting visual evidence.

This is brought to the fore at 2.5.1, in a passage (cited at the end of Chapter 3), where Herodotus states that anyone can see that parts of the Egyptian land have been gained from the river, but then qualifies this: 'well, *a man of intelligence* at any rate' (emphasis added) (ὅστις γε σύνεσιν ἔχει).[125] Similarly, Lichas' wisdom plays a key role in helping him decode the evidence collated from his own autopsy, that of the blacksmith and his story to work out that the bones buried beneath the forge are those of Orestes: 'Lichas made the discovery through a combination of luck and intelligence' (συντυχίῃ χρησάμενος καὶ σοφίῃ – 1.68.1). And of course Solon, the first character in the text to demonstrate a mastery of *opsis*, is famous for his wisdom (λόγος ... σοφίης εἵνεκεν – 1.30.2).

Herodotus thus clearly signifies that autopsy alone is not enough: in order to interpret visual evidence accurately, one needs an intelligent, enquiring mind and a thirst for knowledge, as is demonstrated by Herodotus in the passage on his search for the origins of Heracles – 'desiring to know about these matters as clearly as possible, I sailed to Tyre' (καὶ θέλων δὲ τούτων πέρι σαφές τι εἰδέναι ἐξ ὧν οἷόν τε ἦν, ἔπλευσα καὶ ἐς Τύρον – 2.44.1). And it is of course desire for knowledge about

[124] δηλοῖ τέ μοι ὅτι πάντα τὰ πρήγματα τῶν βαρβάρων ἤρτητο ἑκ Περσέων, εἰ καὶ τότε οὗτοι πρὶν ἢ καὶ συμμῖξαι τοῖσι πολεμίοισι ἔφευγον, ὅτι καὶ τοὺς Πέρσας ὥρων.

[125] Also noted by Schepens (1980) 68 who thinks that ὄψις and σύνεσις are 'les deux éléments servant de base à l'exposé d'Hérodote' and (92) that σύνεσις is 'une condition essentielle de l'utilisation de l'autopsie'.

the world, not for power or wealth or even just for the act of seeing itself, which validates the use of *opsis* as a source, knowledge (εἰδέναι) being predicated on sight (εἶδον). This is perhaps, the final lesson on *opsis* which Herodotus wishes to teach his audience, and the model of historiography which he wants to present.

The previous chapter examined the question of whether it is ever possible for humans to obtain complete knowledge about the world or whether this level of knowledge is reserved for the gods alone. Herodotus even has characters in the text voice this concern.[126] It has become clear that Herodotus does not present us with a coherent picture of the framework that is formed by fate, the gods and humans as regards their knowledge of the world and comprehension of the future; nor, arguably, does he intend to. However, this does not deflect from the importance of *opsis* in providing humans with access to the level of knowledge which is granted to them within that framework.

It would appear, therefore, that *opsis* has different levels of meaning in the narrative. While it partly serves as a narrative device for Herodotus, it also has a very different purpose in allowing Herodotus to teach his audience how to handle *opsis* as a source: the pitfalls in following it too literally and unthinkingly, but also its immense value when interpreted with sufficient intelligence. The portrayal of *opsis* in the narrative is complex, but it is not incompatible with that in the metanarrative when considered in the context of the didactic nature of the text.

While the metanarrative provides the ultimate illustration or prototype of the Herodotean method of enquiry (*opsis* as the pinnacle in a hierarchy of sources), the narrative provides a more subtle means for Herodotus to demonstrate to his audience the skill needed for a successful command of this source. This in turn adds to Herodotus' authority both as an investigator and a narrator,[127] and is especially relevant when viewed in the context of the fifth-century BC Ionian intellectual climate, an aspect of the text which will be explored in the next chapter.

[126] See, for example, Xerxes at 7.50.2: εἰδέναι δὲ ἄνθρωπον ἐόντα κῶς χρὴ τὸ βέβαιον; δοκέω μὲν οὐδαμῶς.

[127] On Herodotus' authority, see in particular Luraghi (2006) and (2009) and Marincola (1997).

Chapter 6

Opsis in Context

καὶ θέλων δὲ τούτων πέρι σαφές τι εἰδέναι ἐξ ὧν οἷόν τε ἦν, ἔπλευσα καὶ ἐς Τύρον τῆς Φοινίκης … καὶ εἶδον πλουσίως κατεσκευασμένον ἄλλοισί τε πολλοῖσι ἀναθήμασι

'But I wished to know about these matters as clearly as possible, so I also sailed to Tyre in Phoenicia ... and I saw the sanctuary there was lavishly appointed with very many dedications'.

Histories, 2.44.1-2

6.1: Introduction

In Chapters 2 and 3, the extraordinary scope and quantity of eyewitness statements in the metanarrative of the *Histories* were explored. I argued that overall there are up to forty-seven direct references to Herodotus' autopsy in the text, and potentially a further eighty-four, if the phrases ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ, ἔτι (καὶ νῦν), (ἔτι καὶ) τὸ μέχρι ἐμεῦ, καὶ νῦν κεῖται / ἐστὶ, ἐστᾶσι / ἵδρυται / ἐστὶ, and ἀξιοθέητος are accepted as indications of autopsy when they refer to physical objects. The purpose of this chapter is in part to move away from the text to examine Herodotus' use of autopsy in the context of predecessors' and contemporaries' approaches to empirical methods.

In the last thirty years or so, there has been a move in Herodotean scholarship to view and analyse the *Histories* within the context of the contemporary (late fifth-century BC) intellectual climate of the natural philosophers and medical writers.[1]

[1] See Jouanna (1999) 188-90 and (2012) 106 for a comparison of the Hippocratic and Herodotean treatment of Scythian impotence, (1999) 225-31 on their approach to ethnography and the influence of climate on health and (2012) 141-5 on their approach to dietetics; Irwin (2014) on the interaction with Hippocratic ideas in the Ethiopian *logos* in *Histories* 3.17-26; Hollmann (2011) 251-4 on the similarities between the Hippocratics and Herodotus' use of signs. For an analysis of the Hippocratics in a fifth-century BC context, see also Holmes (2010) 9-11 on the importance of viewing the Hippocratics within the broader intellectual milieu of the fifth-century BC Greek world; Jouanna (2012) 39-53 on the Hippocratic contribution to the development of the art of rhetoric in the second half of the fifth century BC which he considers 'indispensable' (39) (see also Lloyd (2012) 83 on this) and 55-79 on Hippocratic interaction with Greek tragedy; Lloyd (2012) 63-4 on the Hippocratics as part of the debate on the nature of the divine; Baragwanath (2012) 55-6 on

This is in contrast to an earlier tendency to see Herodotus as belonging more to the early sixth- and late fifth-century BC world of Ionian science and as having an 'archaic' mentality as argued, for example, by Wells in his 1923 essay on Herodotus and his age.[2]

However, the work of scholars such as Lateiner and Thomas has clearly demonstrated that there is much to be gained from a close analysis of Herodotus alongside the work of the Hippocratic writers and natural philosophers.[3] Lateiner has argued that both Herodotus and the Hippocratics share a similar impulse towards the promotion of empirical methods, while Thomas proposes that pretty much all aspects of Herodotus' work – his ethnographic and geographic interests and theories, love of polemic, rhetorical style, focus on observation and wonders, to name a few – place him firmly within the East Greek intellectual *koine* of the late fifth-century BC.[4]

More recently, Bartoš has shown how the *Histories* reveal a keen interest in the medical and scientific questions of the day, for example, in Herodotus' descriptions of unusual diseases and his exploration of the impact of climate on human health.[5] Further, van der Eijk has discussed the overlap in thought, methods of enquiry and areas of interest between the medical writers and the early philosophers.[6]

Herodotus' determination to discover the truth about the past as part of the broader search for knowledge in the fifth-century BC enlightenment. Dewald (1985) 63 has also pointed to the similarities between Herodotean and Sophistic thought, especially that of Protagoras.

[2] Wells (1923) 188.

[3] For an overview of the Hippocratic corpus, its theories and practices see Nutton (2004) 53-102; Jouanna (1999); van der Eijk (2005b) 45-135; more generally in the context of a cross-cultural comparison of methods of enquiry in ancient societies, Lloyd (2014) especially on the polemical nature of the Hippocratic texts; Lesher (2008) on the championing by the early philosophers of seeking understanding of the world through enquiry.

[4] Lateiner (1986); Thomas (2000) and (2006). See also Nutton (2004) 50: Herodotus' approach to historical processes and foreign peoples has strong parallels with the Hippocratic works.

[5] Bartoš (2015) 22-3; see also Lloyd (2003) 116-20 on Herodotus' interest in disease. See Nutton (2004) 75-7 for the Hippocratic interest in the effect of climate on human health. This kind of environmental determinism is also found in the *Histories* on which see Sassi (2001) 105-11 (comparing Herodotus to *Airs, Waters, Places*).

[6] Van der Eijk (2008). He points out that the philosophers were not just theorists but were also interested in the practical application of their ideas, while the Hippocratics recognised the importance of understanding the nature of man in the context of the wider cosmos.

The following discussion will analyse some key passages on *opsis* from the Presocratic philosophers and Hippocratic texts alongside Herodotus, in order to highlight the similarities and differences between them. Is Herodotus' use of autopsy simply evidence of participation in a contemporary debate on the value of empiricism, or does it also represent a radical departure from current ideas? And does such a comparison reveal that Herodotus was as intellectually at home with his contemporaries as his modern interpreters suggest?

6.2: Presocratics and Hippocratics: Herodotus' Contribution

The Hippocratic texts, the majority of which were probably written in the late fifth century BC, have been recognised by scholars as advocates of *opsis*.[7] From the careful daily observations of symptoms documented in *Epidemics* and *Prognosis* to the championing of an empirical method over a 'hypothesis' (ὑποθεσις) by the author of *On Ancient Medicine*, the Hippocratics clearly appreciated the value of *opsis* to doctors in their practice and in persuading their (potential) patients of the value of medicine.[8] So *Prognosis* advises doctors of the visible symptoms they should watch out for when diagnosing acute diseases (σκέπτεσθαι δὲ χρὴ ὧδε ἐν τοῖσιν ὀξέσι νουσήμασι – 2),[9] while the author of *On the Art of Medicine* notes the best doctors have realised that deeds, not words, will persuade patients of the doctor's skill (ἐκ τῶν ἔργων ἐπιδεικνύουσιν, οὐ τὸ λέγειν καταμελετήσαντες – 14).

However, the medical writers were not the first to advocate *opsis* as the best means of gaining knowledge. As Hussey has pointed out, in Homer's *Iliad* and

[7] See, for example: Thumiger (2016) 107 on the collecting of observable data as a key component of putting together a patient's case history and also Jouanna (1999) 291 on the patient as the source of observable data; Holmes (2012) 28-31 on the importance of observations for understanding the differences between the male and female bodies; Holmes (2010) and (2015) on symptoms as the observable evidence of, and path to knowledge about, disease; Lloyd (1991) 94 on the empirical nature of the Hippocratic texts in the context of experiment in early Greek medicine; van der Eijk (2008) 398-400 on the importance of autopsy and careful observation to the Hippocratic method.

[8] For an interesting discussion of *On Ancient Medicine* including an analysis of its polemical characteristics, see Lloyd (1991) 49-69.

[9] Although the word σύμπτωμα does not appear in extant medical texts until the third century BC (and in any case does not precisely equate with our 'symptom'), as noted by Holmes (2015) 191-2; rather, the fifth-century BC Hippocratic texts write about signs and proofs. See also Mann (2012) 217-8 on visible phenomena as the 'signs' of a disease as noted by the author of *On the Art of Medicine*, 11.

Odyssey, true knowledge is acquired by direct sight, even though this ability is reserved for the gods:

> ἔσπετε νῦν μοι Μοῦσαι Ὀλύμπια δώματ᾽ ἔχουσαι:
> ὑμεῖς γὰρ θεαί ἐστε πάρεστέ τε ἴστέ τε πάντα,
> ἠμεῖς δὲ κλέος οἷον ἀκούομεν οὐδέ τι ἴδμεν…
>
> Tell me now, you muses who have your homes on Olympos – you are gods, and attend all things and know all things, but we hear only the report and have no knowledge... – *Iliad*, 2.484-6

The gods have access to knowledge because they are present (and therefore eyewitnesses) at all events, whereas men have to rely on *akoe*, a poor substitute.[10]

There is some evidence that the early Presocratic philosophers reasoned along similar lines. The philosopher-doctor Alcmaeon, who was active in Croton in the early fifth century BC, wrote extensively about the eye and was allegedly the first to conduct dissections (according to Calcidius).[11] Theophrastus states that Alcmaeon was also very interested in each of the senses and how they function.[12] One of the few remaining fragments of his work seems to imply that he made a connection between sight and knowledge: 'about matters invisible the gods possess clear knowledge, but as far as humans may judge...'.[13] Of course it is very difficult to reconstruct the views of a man for whom so little evidence remains, but it seems that Alcmaeon did in some way champion the use of *opsis* and make the connection between sight and knowledge.[14]

This connection also appears to have been endorsed by both Xenophanes and Heraclitus. According to Hippolytus, Xenophanes used empirical evidence (fossils found in various places on land) as proof of his theory that the earth is dissolved by

---

[10] Hussey (1990) 12, 16.

[11] Calcidius, *Commentary on the* Timaeus, CCXLVI 279.

[12] Theophrastus, *On the Senses*, 25-6.

[13] περὶ τῶν ἀφανέων, περὶ τῶν θνητῶν σαφήνειαν μὲν θεοὶ ἔχοντι, ὡς δὲ ἄνθρωποις τεκμαίρεσθαι καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς, DK 24B1; Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers*, VIII 83.

[14] See Barnes (1982) 149-51 on Alcmaeon's empiricism and the links between visual evidence and knowledge in his epistemological theory.

the sea.[15] One of the key principles of his cosmology was that 'explanations should never postulate the existence of anything not directly observed to exist',[16] though at times he appears to share Homer's view that man is unable to use sight to attain knowledge.[17] As for Heraclitus, this master of the obscure appears to have valued the senses as a source of knowledge, as far as we can tell from the extant fragments of his work:

> ὅσων ὄψις ἀκοὴ μάθησις, ταῦτα ἐγὼ προτιμέω
>
> The things I rate highly are those which are accessible to sight, hearing, apprehension.[18]

According to Polybius,[19] he also placed sight ahead of hearing for its ability to help us reach the truth:

> δυεῖν γὰρ ὄντων κατὰ φύσιν ὡσανεί τινων ὀργάνων ἡμῖν, οἷς πάντα πυνθανόμεθα καὶ πολυπραγμονοῦμεν, ἀκοῆς καὶ ὀράσεως, ἀληθινωτέρας δ' οὔσης οὐ μικρῶι τῆς ὀράσεως κατὰ τὸν Ἡράκλειτον
>
> We have two natural instruments, as it were, by which we learn everything and conduct our business, namely hearing and sight; and sight, according to Heraclitus, is not a little truer.

This is of course strongly reminiscent of Herodotus' claim that *opsis* is a more accurate and trustworthy source than *akoe* (see further discussion below).[20]

---

[15] DK 21A33; Hippolytus*, Refutation of All Heresies*, I xiv 5-6.

[16] Theophrastus, *On the Senses*, 26.

[17] 'And the clear truth no man has seen/knows concerning the gods and all the matters of which I speak' καὶ τὸ μὲν οὖν σαφὲς οὔτις ἀνὴρ γένετ' οὐδέ τις ἔσται εἰδὼς ἀμφὶ θεῶν τε καὶ ἄσσα λέγω περὶ πάντων, DK 21B34; Sextus Empiricus, *Against the Mathematicians*, VII 49. See Barnes (1982) 138-9 on this passage.

[18] DK 22B55; Hippolytus, *Refutation of All Heresies*, IX ix 1-x 9. It is true that as far as we can tell from the surviving fragments of his work, Heraclitus often made contradictory statements and it is therefore difficult to establish a coherent Heraclitan view of the world. However, his claims about sense perception may still be valuable as a reflection of the ideas which were circulating at the time.

[19] DK 22B101a; Polybius, *Histories*, XII xxvii 1.

[20] Heraclitus DK 22B107 (Sextus Empiricus, *Against the Mathematicians*, VII 126) may indicate an alternative view (κακοὶ μάρτυρες ἀνθρώποισιν ὀφθαλμοὶ καὶ ὦτα βαρβάρους ψυχὰς ἐχόντων: 'eyes and ears are bad witnesses for men if they have souls that cannot understand their language') but this appears to be saying that people can misinterpret what they perceive (a view with which Herodotus would have agreed, as we have seen in Chapters 4 and 5) rather than denying the value

Despite the fragmentary nature of the evidence, some of the philosophers of the sixth and early fifth centuries BC do seem to have made the link between seeing and knowledge, used *opsis* as proof for their theories and even argued that *opsis* was the most trustworthy of the senses for their enquiries. It is therefore hard to agree with Lateiner that Herodotus was the first person outside of the medical field to do 'sustained empirical research'.[21] The evidence is too fragmentary to draw a firm conclusion but it may be that Alcmaeon and Xenophanes, if not others, used empirical methods in their enquiries and for collecting data to support their theories.

What is clear is that by the mid-fifth century BC, philosophers were moving away from the idea that knowledge is based on sense-perception.[22] Anaxagoras attacked the senses:

> ὑπ' ἀφαυρότητος αὐτῶν ... οὐ δυνατοί ἐσμεν κρίνειν τ'ἀληθές
>
> We are not capable of discerning the truth by reason of their feebleness.

He apparently conducted an experiment in which two colours, black and white, were slowly mixed together drop by drop and concluded:

> οὐ δυνήσεται ἡ ὄψις διακρίνειν τὰς παρὰ μικρὸν μεταβολάς, καίπερ πρὸς τὴν φύσιν ὑποκειμένας
>
> Our eyes will not be able to discriminate the gradual changes even though they exist in nature.[23]

Parmenides advocated logical deduction as the path to true knowledge when he exhorted his audience not to follow

---

of *opsis* and *akoe* as sources of knowledge altogether. Lloyd's view that Heraclitus exhibits a 'guarded, critical acceptance of [the senses]' may be a fair conclusion (Lloyd (1979) 130). See also Barnes (1982) 146-7 on the links between sense-perception and knowledge in Heraclitus.

[21] Lateiner (1986) 17; indeed, it is perhaps difficult to establish that there was such a concept as 'sustained empirical research' at this time.

[22] See Lloyd (1987) 271 on the Presocratic roots of a preference for reason over perception.

[23] DK 59B21; Sextus Empiricus, *Against the Mathematicians*, VII 90. See Barnes (1982) 49 on the use of experiment by the Presocratics. He argues that experimental observation (as opposed to simple observation of phenomena) in fact played little role in Presocratic methodology.

> ἄσκοπον ὄμμα καὶ ἠχήεσσαν ἀκουήν καὶ γλῶσσαν, κρῖναι δὲ λόγωι πολύδηριν ἔλεγχον ἐξ ἐμέθεν ῥηθέντα
>
> unobservant eye and echoing ear and tongue; but judge by reason the battle-hardened proof which I have spoken.[24]

Melissus gave a detailed critique of *opsis*, a sense which tells us that things change even when this cannot be the case:

> δῆλον τοίνυν, ὅτι οὐκ ὀρθῶς ἐωρῶμεν, οὐδὲ ἐκεῖνα πολλὰ ὀρθῶς δοκεῖ εἶναι
>
> Clearly, then, we did not see things correctly and we are wrong in taking these many things to exist.[25]

These few fragments suggest that by the mid-fifth century BC, some philosophers had begun to doubt how useful the senses, sight in particular, really were in the search for knowledge, especially for the big questions on the nature of existence and the universe which were not easily subject to sense-perception. Instead, rational deduction and argument were becoming the preferred tools for supporting their theories. It is in this context that the Hippocratics' and Herodotus' promotion of an empirical method must be understood.[26]

Indeed, the author of *Ancient Medicine* appears to be distancing himself from these very philosophers and their modes of enquiry when he says: 'I do not think that medicine is in need of some new postulate, dealing, for instance, with invisible or problematic substances and about which one must have some postulate or other in order to discuss them seriously. In such matters medicine differs from subjects like astronomy and geology [lit: matters of the heavens and the earth], of which a man might know the truth and lecture on it without either he or his audience being able to judge whether it were the truth or not, because there is no sure criterion' (1).[27]

---

[24] DK 28B1; Sextus Empiricus, *Against the Mathematicians*, VII 11.

[25] DK 30B8; Simplicius, *Commentary on Aristotle's* On the Heavens, 558.17-559.13.

[26] See Müller (1981) 313 noting that while for Herodotus sense-perception can lead directly to knowledge, for the Presocratics the evidence of the senses can be misleading and must be judged by reason.

[27] διὸ οὐκ ἠξίουν αὐτὴν ἔγωγε κενῆς ὑποθέσιος δεῖσθαι ὥσπερ τὰ ἀφανέα τε καὶ ἀπορεόμενα, περὶ ὧν ἀνάγκη, ἤν τις ἐπιχειρῇ τι λέγειν, ὑποθέσει χρῆσθαι, οἷον περὶ τῶν μετεώρων ἢ τῶν ὑπὸ γῆν: ἃ

Empedocles is specifically mentioned as an example of this kind of methodology (20).[28]

The Hippocratic writers were part of what Hussey calls the 'empiricist backlash' that occurred in the late fifth century BC.[29] As already mentioned, some of the Hippocratic texts are based on an obvious empiricism in their close observation of symptoms and documenting of medical examinations. In this context, it is worth noting that the use of the authorial first person, so familiar from Herodotus, clearly plays an important role in supporting a superior claim to knowledge, as Thumiger has observed.[30]

But many of the Hippocratics also appeal to *opsis* more broadly to support their various medical theories. Thus the author of *On the Nature of Man* justifies his claim that blood, phlegm and bile are different substances by pointing out that they so appear to the senses, including sight: πῶς γὰρ ἂν ἐοικότα ταῦτα εἴη ἀλλήλοισιν, ὧν οὔτε τὰ χρώματα ὅμοια φαίνεται προσορώμενα, οὔτε τῇ χειρὶ ψαύοντι ὅμοια δοκεῖ εἶναι; ('For how could they be alike when there is no similarity in appearance, and when they are different to the sense of touch?' – 5).

Here *opsis* is being employed to demonstrate the very nature of certain substances as part of a wider argument on the constitution of man. Likewise the author of *On the Sacred Disease* uses autopsy to support his argument that unexplained symptoms in a disease do not necessarily mean it has a divine cause: τοῦτο δὲ ὀρῶ μαινομένους ἀνθρώπους καὶ παραφρονέοντας ἀπὸ οὐδεμιῆς προφάσιος ἐμφανέος ('I have seen men go mad and become delirious for no obvious reason' – 1).

This appeal to *opsis* to support a theory has clear parallels in Herodotus. At 2.5-12 he employs a series of proofs, all based on *opsis*, to argue that much of northern Egypt was once under water and the land has been slowly gained from the sea: 'it appears so to me ... for it is clear to anyone who has not heard about it but just uses

---

εἴ τις λέγοι καὶ γινώσκοι ὡς ἔχει, οὔτ' ἂν αὐτῷ τῷ λέγοντι οὔτε τοῖς ἀκούουσι δῆλα ἂν εἴη, εἴτε ἀληθέα ἐστὶν εἴτε μή. οὐ γὰρ ἔστι πρὸς ὅ τι χρὴ ἀνενέγκαντα εἰδέναι τὸ σαφές.

[28] See Warren (2007) 11.

[29] Hussey (1990) 37. See also Lateiner (1986), Thomas (2000) and van der Eijk (2005b) 25.

[30] Thumiger (2016) 125: 'the emergence of the first person more generally has an epistemological value – it is a marker of scientific enquiry and possess [*sic*] of knowledge'.

his eyes ... [that such is the case]' (μοι ἑδόκεον … δῆλα γὰρ δὴ καὶ μὴ προακούσαντι, ἰδόντι δέ… – 2.5.1); 'this was my personal impression' ... the land south of Memphis 'looked to me' as if it had once been a gulf of the sea (ἑδόκεε καὶ αὐτῷ μοι εἶναι … ἐφαίνετό μοι εἶναι – 2.10.1); 'I particularly think this way because I have seen' that Egypt projects into the sea, 'shells appear' in the mountains, there is salt on the ground responsible for corroding the pyramids, sand in the mountains above Memphis, mud and silt in the soil (αὐτὸς οὕτω κάρτα δοκέω εἶναι, ἰδών … κογχύλιά τε φαινόμενα… – 2.12.1).

Herodotus bombards his audience with proofs gathered through autopsy to convince us that his theory is correct. In fact, the observation of shells in the mountains was a favourite proof for theories about the relationship between land and sea. In the previous century, Xenophanes had pointed to the finding of shells in mountains and on land, the impression of a fish in the quarries at Syracuse and of a goby in rock on Paros, and the traces of many sea-creatures on Malta as evidence that the sea had mingled with and dissolved the land.[31]

The Lydian historian Xanthus, a contemporary of Herodotus, also used the observation of petrified marine animals far inland into Lydia to conclude that the area was once under water.[32] At 2.5-12 Herodotus is therefore tapping into earlier and contemporary debates on the relationship between land and sea and the empirical methods used to advance those arguments. But he also appears to have gone further in the quality and quantity of his observations and the range of autopsy vocabulary that he used to support just one idea.

Another key concern of the Hippocratic writers was to prove their medical theories through demonstration: the phrase ἐγὼ ἀποδείξω is a common one throughout the texts.[33] As mentioned above, deeds convince patients more than words. Put simply: ἀλλὰ τὴν πίστιν τῷ πλήθει ἐξ ὧν ἂν ἴδωσιν οἰκειοτέρην

[31] DK 21A33; Hippolytus, *Refutation of All Heresies*, I xiv 5-6. See Warren (2007) 54 on empirical observation and inference based on visible phenomena as a key method of enquiry for Xenophanes.

[32] *FrGrHist* 765 F 12 and 13.

[33] For example: *On the Nature of Man*, 2; *On the Sacred Disease*, 1.

ἠγεύμενοι ἢ ἐξ ὧν ἂν ἀκούσωσιν ('[The best doctors] realise that most people are more ready to believe what they see than what they hear' – *Art of Medicine*, 14).[34]

The author is not alone in this belief.[35] It is reminiscent of Heraclitus' maxim: ὀφθαλμοὶ γὰρ τῶν ὤτων ἀκριβέστεροι μάρτυρες ('for eyes are more accurate witnesses than ears')[36] and of course Herodotus' famous phrase as spoken by Candaules: ὦτα γὰρ τυγχάνει ἀνθρώποισι ἐόντα ἀπιστότερα ὀφθαλμῶν ('men trust their eyes more than their ears' – 1.8.2).[37]

Indeed, as discussed in Chapter 3, Herodotus endorses this view throughout his work by using *opsis* to verify or refute oral tradition and is always keen to distinguish between the two sources, usually linking *opsis* with firm knowledge and *akoe* with uncertainty. Two key passages can be cited by way of example. On his visit to the labyrinth near Lake Moeris in Egypt, Herodotus distinguishes between the upper rooms which he has seen and so can speak about definitively, and the lower rooms about which he has only heard:

> τὰ μέν νυν μετέωρα τῶν οἰκημάτων αὐτοί τε ὡρῶμεν διεξιόντες καὶ αὐτοὶ θεησάμενοι λέγομεν, τὰ δὲ αὐτῶν ὑπόγαια λόγοισι ἐπυνθανόμεθα
>
> I myself went through the ground floor rooms and saw them, and so I speak from firsthand knowledge, but the underground ones were only described to me (2.148.5).

---

[34] See Mann (2012) 233 who suggests we should ask whether the author in fact accepts this proposition given that he feels the need for a written treatise.

[35] 'La formule finale est un lieu common' in Jouanna's words (2003) 269. See Mann (2012) 232-3 for commentary on this passage. He argues that while the author is clearly interacting with a current idea, his formulation of it (that the best doctors realise that most people are more ready to believe what they see) leaves open the possibility that he considers their judgement incorrect: 'the formula concerns not the ideal method of acquiring knowledge, but the rather the cognitive psychology of conviction'.

[36] DK 22B101a; Polybius, *Histories*, XII xxvii 1.

[37] For an alternative view see Empedocles DK 31B3B; Sextus Empiricus, *Against the Mathematicians*, VII 123-5: μήτε τιν' ὄψιν ἔχων πίστει πλέον ἢ κατ' ἀκουήν ἢ ἀκοὴν ἐρίδουπον ὑπὲρ τρανώματα γλώσσης ('neither hold sight more in trust than hearing, nor hearing above the clarities of the tongue'). Empedocles may be reacting against the popularity of this formula.

Likewise he is unable to verify the story about the well in Cyrauis, merely repeating what he has heard.[38] But he can be sure about a possibly similar well in Zacynthos which he has seen for himself:

> ταῦτα εί μὲν ἔστι ἀληθέως οὐκ οἶδα, τὰ δὲ λέγεται γράφω. εἴη δ᾽ ἂν πᾶν … αὐτὸς ἐγὼ ὥρων
>
> I do not know whether this story is true; I am simply recording what is said. But it might all be true, since I have personally seen... (4.195.2).

It is worth noting the use in both these passages of the standard μὲν ... δὲ contrast phrase which in each case highlights the deliberate distinction made between *opsis* and *akoe*. At 2.148.5, by using two different words for seeing (ὠρῶμεν ... θεησάμενοι) and the repetition of αὐτοὶ, Herodotus emphasises his own autopsy and therefore his ability to speak to his audience from a position of authority (λέγομεν): they can trust their ears because the speaker is an eyewitness. At 4.195.2, Herodotus not only contrasts his sources, but also equates *akoe* with a lack of knowledge (οὐκ οἶδα) and *opsis* with credence.

Herodotus' contrasting of sources and favouring of *opsis* over *akoe* should therefore be viewed as part of a fifth-century BC debate on the senses: whether they can provide access to knowledge, convince an audience of an argument, or whether one is more helpful and trustworthy than the others. But what about subjects that are not susceptible to sense-perception? How does an empiricist deal with the invisible? It has been suggested that the Presocratics moved away from observation-based theories largely because they were interested in subjects that were rare or invisible (what lies under the earth, the constituents of the universe etc.).[39] The Hippocratics faced a similar challenge in how to deal with invisible (i.e., internal) diseases, and Herodotus tapped into this contemporary debate.[40]

Some philosophers and doctors thought that the invisible realm was simply not subject to human knowledge. Hence Alcmaeon's belief that only the gods have

---

[38] A favourite claim of Herodotus; 2.123 and 7.152 are the most famous examples. See Chapter 3, Section 3.3 for a discussion of the relationship between *opsis* and *akoe* in Herodotus' methodology.

[39] Lloyd (1979) 139.

[40] For a good discussion on this topic, see Thomas (2000) 200-11; Bartoš (2015) 139ff.

knowledge of invisible matters (τῶν ἀφανέων), or the author of *Ancient Medicine*'s claim that medicine is not in need of any new postulate regarding 'invisible or problematic substances' (τὰ ἀφανέα τε καὶ ἀπορεόμενα – 1).

Occasionally Herodotus appears to agree with this view, as when he famously denies the possibility of arguing against the existence of Ocean because as an invisible subject it 'does not admit of refutation' (ὁ δὲ περὶ τοῦ Ὠκεανοῦ λέξας ἐς ἀφανὲς τὸν μῦθον ἀνενείκας οὐκ ἔχει ἔλεγχον – 2.23). Therefore he does not know whether it exists (οὐ … οἶδα) and picks up on this link between the invisible and lack of knowledge in Book 3 when he adds, 'I have been unable to find anyone who has personally seen a sea on the other side of Europe who can tell me about it' (τοῦτο δὲ οὐδενὸς αὐτόπτεω γενομένου δύναμαι ἀκοῦσαι … ὅκως θάλασσα ἐστι τὰ ἐπέκεινα τῆς Εὐρώπης – 3.115.2).

However, from at least Anaxagoras onwards (ὄψις γὰρ τῶν ἀδήλων τὰ φαινόμενα: 'things that appear are a vision of things that are obscure'),[41] there existed a theory that one could use visible phenomena to conjecture about the invisible.[42] The Hippocratics certainly took this to heart and their texts are peppered with such attempts.[43] The most obvious example of this idea in action was the use of external, visible symptoms to learn about internal, invisible diseases.[44] The author of *Art of Medicine* explains that by feeding a patient acrid food and drink so that phlegm is produced, medicine 'may form a conclusion by vision concerning those things that

[41] DK 59B21a; Sextus Empiricus, *Against the Mathematicians*, VII 140.

[42] See Lloyd (2015) 60, 72-5 for further discussion of this idea; also Barnes (1982) 538-40, who translates this as 'the phenomena are the sight of what is unclear'; although he argues that the phrase is an aphorism rather than a serious philosophical statement, he draws a comparison between Anaxagoras, the Hippocratics and Herodotus in their use of visible phenomena to gain knowledge of the invisible.

[43] See Bartoš (2015) 139: drawing analogies between the visible and the invisible was 'one of the most common methodological features of early Greek philosophy and science in general'. Jouanna (1999) 322, however, argues that the Hippocratics went a step further than the analogy between visible and invisible as espoused by Anaxagoras in creating an interpretative method: 'it no longer amounted to reconstructing the invisible by analogical transposition of the visible; it was a way of deciphering the invisible through the interpretation of visible signs'.

[44] See Nutton (2004) 77-8 on observation and analogy as the basis for Hippocratic physiology; Holmes (2010) 12-16, 129-30 on the use of visible symptoms to make inferences about invisible causes of disease – symptoms are 'a means of seeing that proceeds through inferential leaps from phenomena into an unseen world' (16). This combination of seeing and inference could be viewed as analogous to Herodotus' use of *opsis* and *gnome*.

were before invisible' (ὅπως τεκμήρηταί τι ὀφθὲν περὶ ἐκείνων ὧν αὐτῇ ἐν ἀμηχανῳ τὸ ὀφθῆναι ἦν – 13).

Likewise *Ancient Medicine* argues that the type of bodily organ best suited to attracting and absorbing moisture is narrow and tapering because this is what is 'visible from outside the body' (ἔξωθεν ἐκ τῶν φανερῶν), e.g., sucking up liquid through a straw is easier than with an open mouth (22).[45] Herodotus too can be found using this concept, for example, in his famous comparison of the sources of the Nile and the Ister where he tries to make inferences about the former from knowledge of the latter: 'since we may draw on the apparent to understand the unknown' (τοῖσι ἐμφανέσι τὰ μὴ γινωσκόμενα τεκμαιρόμενος – 2.33.2).[46]

This visible to invisible link has been likened to the use of analogy more generally by both the Hippocratics and Herodotus.[47] In particular, Bartoš has drawn attention to the *phusis*/*techne* analogies in Book 1.12-24 of *Regimen* as an illustration of the author's promotion of the visible/invisible analogy in 1.11 as part of a broader discussion on the art of dietetics.[48] Yet despite his apparent refusal to conjecture about the invisible when such an analogy is not possible, Herodotus does not shy away from discussing 'invisible' problems such as the Nile flood (2.24.1).

---

[45] See Jouanna (1999) 315-6 on this analogy in the context of using the visible to construct the invisible: 'this is without question the most representative example of the analogical method as practised by the Hippocratics'; also discussed by Lloyd (2015) 73.

[46] Noted by Jouanna (1999) 318. The similarity with *Art of Medicine*, 13 is striking. See more generally Lloyd (2015) for the use of analogy in ancient Greek thought and in particular 73 for discussion of this comparison between the Nile and the Ister which may be described as a comparison proper in the sense that two different things of the same type (rivers) are being compared.

[47] Thomas (2000) 200, citing Corcella and Lateiner. See also Barnes (1982) 52-6 on the use of analogy by the Presocratics.

[48] Bartoš (2015) 139-44: 'the idea is that the understanding of universal principles in the technological context might facilitate the reader's understanding of the nature of the physiological processes which are themselves necessary for the appreciation and application of the dietetic treatment and prevention' (141). Similarly, visible symptoms or signs (such as a woman might display in the early stages of pregnancy) are illustrative of the invisible condition (in this case, the presence of the foetus). Likewise the skill of dietetics involves 'practis[ing] the skill of understanding invisible things and predicting future events on the basis of a correct discernment of the visible signs, which are, on their own, always ambiguous' (143-4). Dietetics is based on the ability to interpret the visible signs of the invisible disease.

As Thomas has pointed out, Herodotus' use of *gnome* (opinion/argument) is most in evidence in those passages dealing with invisible phenomena.[49] Indeed, at 2.99 he explicitly names *gnome* as a method used in the first half of Book 2: this part of the work deals with several invisible conundrums on which Herodotus gives his opinion, such as the total size of Egypt (2.18.1), the reason for the Nile's summer flooding (2.19-25), the dryness of the air in Egypt and Libya (2.25-6) and the source of the Nile (2.29.5). This is of course very similar to the Hippocratics' use of *gnome* to discuss unobservable problems, for example, the arguments advanced about the constituents of man in *Nature of Man* or the belief in *Art of Medicine* that invisible diseases can be 'captured by the sight of the mind' (ταῦτα τῇ τῆς γνώμης ὄψει κεκράτηται – 11).[50] Neither the Hippocratics nor Herodotus allowed the limitations of *opsis* to prevent them from speculating, and even drawing conclusions, about unobservable phenomena.[51]

To return to *opsis*, it is worth examining a few of the Hippocratic texts in more detail because they place observation at the heart of their arguments and this in turn provides an interesting context to Herodotus' views on sight and knowledge. The core argument in *Ancient Medicine* is that progress in medicine will not come about by proposing postulates/assumptions (ὑπόθεσιν), but by 'someone versed in the observations of the past making these the starting point of his researches' (τις ... τὰ εὑρημένα εἰδὼς ἐκ τούτων ὁρμώμενος ζητῇ – 2). In other words, medicine should be based on observation rather than theory.[52] The author attempts to sustain this argument throughout the text, but fails spectacularly when he advances his own ideas on the constituents of man which appear to be as theory-

[49] Thomas (2000) 189-90.

[50] See Mann (2012) 194-6 on this phrase: although *opsis* is clearly being used here in a broader sense than pure vision, 'perception and observation are crucial to knowledge, even when such knowledge is of things that cannot be directly observed'. There are other examples in the Hippocratic texts: air in the body is 'invisible to sight, visible to reason' (τῇ μὲν ὄψει ἀφανής, τῷ δὲ λογισμῷ φανερός) according to *Breaths*, 3.3.

[51] Hollmann (2011) 253 notes the key parallels between the Hippocratics and Herodotus in their use of external signs to understand internal or invisible conditions. See Sedley (1982) on semiotics in Hellenistic thought.

[52] See Nutton (2004) 63-4 on *Ancient Medicine's* emphasis on medical discoveries made through enquiry and rejection of ungrounded hypotheses (with specific reference to Empedocles) in particular because of their lack of an empirical basis; also van der Eijk (2005b) 122-3; Lloyd (2014) 48-9.

based as those of his contemporaries he so much despises (see, for example, 14 where it is argued that man consists of qualities such as sweetness and sharpness).

The author of *Art of Medicine*, however, takes the argument a step further and this text is rich with vocabulary related to seeing. Despite his optimistic stance on the power of reason to learn about the invisible diseases (λογισμός: see especially 11), he has no doubt that *opsis* is the best tool for the doctor: 'as to our human constitution, if it admits of being seen, it will also admit of being healed' (ἡ δ' ἣν μὲν διεξαρκέσῃ ἐς τὸ ὀφθῆναι, ἐξαρκέσει καὶ ἐς τὸ ὑγιανθῆναι – 11).

Indeed, in a radical and highly philosophical passage which probably demonstrates participation in an ongoing debate which goes back to Parmenides, he argues that sight is the very proof of existence: 'but the existent is always seen and known, and the non-existent is neither seen nor known' (ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν ἐόντα αἰεὶ ὀρᾶταί τε καὶ γινώσκεται, τὰ δὲ μὴ ἐόντα οὔτε ὀρᾶται οὔτε γινώσκεται – 2). Although this proposition is perhaps undermined by the argument that invisible diseases can be mastered by reasoning alongside other senses such as smell and hearing, the author continues to maintain that *opsis* is still the best tool: 'to see with the sight with which all men see most perfectly' (ἰδεῖν ὄψει, ᾗ τὰ πάντα πάντες ἱκανωτάτως ὀρῶσι – 13).[53]

However, the general consensus among modern scholars such as Lloyd, Lateiner, Laskaris and Jouanna is that the Hippocratics are proponents of theory-led observation rather than observation-led theory, having failed in their attempts to place observation at the heart of their arguments.[54] Certainly texts such as *Ancient Medicine* and *Nature of Man* seem unable to escape from dogmatic theories despite their pro-empirical stance, and Laskaris and Lloyd are right to note that when visible evidence is employed it is used to corroborate or refute pre-existing theories rather than as a starting point of the investigative process.[55]

This is clearly seen in the presentational style of these texts, which tend to put forward the theory first and then provide the empirical data that allegedly

[53] See Mann (2012) 94-5, 206 and 216 on these passages.

[54] Lloyd (1979) 168; Lateiner (1986) 7; Laskaris (2002) 7-9, 77; Jouanna (2005) 25.

[55] Laskaris (2002) 9; Lloyd (1979) 151.

supports it. For example, *Sacred Disease* first states that the 'sacred' disease is no more divinely caused than any other (5) and that air must keep moving in the body for the limbs to function (7) and then provides observations in support. This style of presentation gives the impression of empirical data specifically selected to support a chosen theory, rather than theories being formed on the basis of detailed observations.

Similarly, the author of *Nature of Man* proposes that the quantity of phlegm increases in the body in winter, before observing that phlegm is cold to the touch and that people have more colds in winter as evidence. Lloyd argues that even works which are more clearly observation-based (such as *Epidemics*) are theory-laden, in that the documenting of symptoms on a daily basis was conditioned by the belief that diseases progressed in 'critical days'.[56]

All this is fair criticism, albeit that pure observation-led theory is impossible in that all observation is to a certain extent conditioned by preconceptions. But it does not detract from the fact that the Hippocratics placed much value on the use of *opsis* for advancing medicine, even if they were ultimately unsuccessful in practising what they preached. And it is hard to agree completely with Laskaris that 'the major influence ... of natural philosophy on fifth-century medicine was not in empiricism, but in theory'.[57] True, the likes of Parmenides, Anaxagoras and Melissus championed logic, reason and argument over sense-perception, but the Hippocratics seem to be making an attempt (even if not fully successful) to recapture the empirical spirit of Xenophanes, Alcmaeon and perhaps Heraclitus. Again, Hussey's phrase 'empirical backlash' comes to mind.

Where does Herodotus fit in? He too may be guilty of this theory-led observation, especially in those sections where he discusses physiology and disease, the specialism of the medical writers. His (rather puzzling) observation that the Persian skulls found at the site of the battle of Pelusium were much more brittle than those of the Egyptians is explained by the Egyptian custom of shaving their heads from childhood which results in the skull being thickened by the sun (3.12).

[56] Lloyd (1979) 154.

[57] Laskaris (2002) 17.

Thomas suggests that Herodotus may have been conditioned to make this observation by his theory (evidenced throughout the work) that customs (*nomoi*) – and to some extent climate – determine the nature of man. In other words, he saw what he expected to see.[58] Asheri similarly proposes that Herodotus may have been led to his conclusion by his theories on baldness.[59] However, one redeeming feature of this passage is that Herodotus presents his observation of the skulls first and his interpretation second, suggesting that at least his investigative approach is constructed to allow theory to follow observation rather than the other way round.

One connection seen again and again in the Hippocratic texts is that between sight and knowledge. This is found in the examples cited above (τὰ εὑρημένα εἰδὼς; ὀρᾶταί τε καὶ γινώσκεται), to which can be added the contrasting observation in *Art of Medicine* that listening to a patient describe symptoms amounts to 'opinion rather than knowledge' (δοξάζοντες μᾶλλον ἢ εἰδότες – 11).[60] This connection can also be found in many passages in Herodotus: his desire to know clearly (σαφές τι εἰδέναι) about the origins of the Heracles cult takes him to Tyre and Thasos to view the temples of Heracles there (εἶδον ... εἶδον – 2.44); knowledge of certain regions is denied because of lack of autopsy (3.115; 4.16) or because it is based on hearsay alone without corroborating autopsy (4.195); or sometimes he plays on the etymological link between εἶδον and εἰδέναι, for example, Rhodopis' wealth can be seen (or known?) because the iron spits she dedicated at Delphi are still there (ἰδέσθαι – 2.135.3).[61] Herodotus was very much part of a contemporary debate on the importance of *opsis* for attaining knowledge about the world.

From the discussion so far it can be seen that Herodotus' use of autopsy has much in common with both the early Presocratics and especially the Hippocratic writers.

---

[58] Thomas (2000) 32.

[59] Asheri (2007) 409-10.

[60] This is another much-debated contemporary philosophical question – see, for example, Xenophanes DK 21B34, discussed above. Mann (2012) 198 notes in relation to this passage that the doctor cannot rely on the truth of the patient's opinions because 'they are not secured in the proper way (i.e., either through direct observation or by carefully reasoned inference from observed fact)'. For the importance of the relationship between doctor and patient in the Hippocratic texts, see Thumiger (2016) and Holmes (2010).

[61] Other examples might be 1.193 (refusal to discuss the size of millet in Babylon because his audience need to see it for themselves to believe it) and 5.10 (*akoe* not enough for knowledge of a region – northern Thrace – that has never been seen).

Herodotus shares with them a desire to corroborate or refute theories with observable data, an attempt to approach 'invisible' phenomena via visible signs, a preference for *opsis* over the other senses as an investigative tool, and the favouring of sight in the advancement of epistemology: Herodotus was perhaps contributing to a re-emphasis on observation in the context of the scepticism of Parmenides and other fifth-century BC natural philosophers. This is not surprising as both he and the Hippocratic doctors worked in and/or visited the same geographical regions such as the cities of Northern Greece.[62]

Herodotus was not unique, therefore, or even the first, to give *opsis* a major role in an 'enquiry' and cannot in this sense be awarded the title 'father of empiricism'.[63] Rather, it is best to see him as interacting with, and contributing to, a contemporary discussion on the benefits of *opsis* for an investigation into the natural world and the nature of man.[64] But there is one vital caveat to this: Herodotus also used *opsis* in a way which no one (as far as we know) had done before him or was doing at the time – to examine the material remains of the past to learn about historical events – and it is this crucial difference between him and his contemporaries to which we now turn.

6.3: Herodotus' Innovation: From Medicine and Natural Philosophy to History

The vast majority of the passages from the *Histories* discussed so far in this chapter refer to natural phenomena. This is no coincidence: the Presocratics and Hippocratics were interested solely in 'scientific' subjects and the purpose up till now has been to show how Herodotus' work sits alongside the use of *opsis* in such fields. However, if we examine all the instances of eyewitness in the *Histories*, it is immediately apparent that the majority of them refer to historical data and not to natural phenomena. Of the forty-seven examples of direct eyewitness, twenty-nine refer to historical or manmade objects, ten to natural phenomena, two to a

[62] See Chang (2005) for more detail on the Hippocratic focus on the cities of Northern Greece and Thasos in particular. We know Herodotus visited these areas: Thasos (2.44; 6.47); Samothrace (2.51); Cyzicus (4.14); Thrace generally (2.103; 5.10; 7.59; 7.111; 7.126; 9.16); Thessaly (7.129).

[63] As Müller (1981) has suggested.

[64] As Raaflaub (2002) 154, for example, has suggested.

combination of both, two to human customs, one to a combination of history and custom, and three are part of general methodological statements. In total thirty-six out of forty-seven (76 per cent) are applied in whole or in part to historical subjects.

If the other phrases (listed in Chapter 2) which arguably indicate autopsy are also included, seventy-one out of the eighty-four instances refer to historical data, three to natural phenomena, one to human custom, and nine to a combination of custom and history, i.e., eighty out of eighty-four (95 per cent) refer in some way to historical data.[65] Overall, out of 131 possible instances of autopsy in the *Histories*, 116 (88 per cent) relate to historical material.

It is vital to emphasise this point as there has been a surprising reluctance among scholars to accept that *opsis* has any serious role to play in the historical enquiry of the *Histories*.[66] By way of example, the following quotes from three leading scholars in this field are cited. While Lateiner agrees that Herodotus applies *opsis* to historical objects, he still insists that 'inquiry into the past does not permit first-hand experience. The inaccessibility of the past is a constant frustration to the researcher'.[67] Luraghi accepts that *opsis* is the 'ultimate proof of truth' for Herodotus, but continues:

> however, Herodotus devoted himself largely to the investigation and recording of the past, a field markedly different in nature from those explored by contemporary Hippocratic writers, natural philosophers and rhetoricians, and *gnome* and *opsis* can account only for a limited part of the impressive display of information comprised in the *Histories*. It is in the realm of oral enquiry that the true secrets of Herodotus' workshop have to lie.[68]

---

[65] For a further breakdown: ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ: history (14), history/custom (4); ἔτι (καὶ νῦν) / (ἔτι καὶ) τὸ μέχρι ἐμεῦ: history (5), natural phenomena (1), custom (1), history/custom (5); καὶ νῦν κεῖται/ἑστὶ, ἐστᾶσι/ἵδρυται/ἑστὶ: history (41), natural phenomena (1); ἀξιοθέητος: history (11), natural phenomena (1).

[66] As noted by Schepens (1980) 38 who also argues that Herodotus was the first to apply autopsy to historical enquiry.

[67] Lateiner (1989) 191.

[68] Luraghi (2006) 78-80.

Thomas advocates an even more sweeping version of this view:

> these [empirical] methods are more obvious and more overt in the sections treating geography, customs, ethnography (and throughout Book II), rather than the narrative of past events. As for the historical narrative itself, it is unclear how far these methods are really applicable to the past, especially the past of archaic and legendary Greece. Many historians, in any case, would be uneasy about seeing the stuff of the past as based on strictly empirical methods in the full scientific sense ... If one means by empirical methods, reliance on evidence of the senses, and of experience, observable evidence (the kind of evidence *Ancient Medicine* stresses), then there is difficulty in seeing any enquiry into the Greek past, reliant as it was on tradition and hearsay, as 'empirical'.[69]

Historians may have traditionally felt 'uneasy' about the application of empirical methods to the study of the past,[70] but with increasing recognition of the benefits of an interdisciplinary approach to writing ancient history, modern-day historians are far more comfortable with observing, and drawing conclusions from, the material remains of the past (including inscriptions) in addition to textual evidence. They also work more closely with archaeologists whose approach to understanding the past *is* the practice of history based on empirical methods.[71] In this sense, arguably historians today are moving closer to Herodotean methods of historical investigation. As for Herodotus, the above statistics indicate that in the *Histories*, *opsis* is far more important for history than for geography or ethnography, despite the text covering the history of archaic (and even legendary – see, e.g., 2.43-5 on Heracles) Greece. This can be further demonstrated by a detailed analysis of how Herodotus uses *opsis* for history-writing.

A good place to begin is Book 2, Herodotus' account of Egyptian geography, ethnography and history. Thomas is right in saying that this book contains a

[69] Thomas (2000) 172; see also Thomas (1997) 134.

[70] See Schepens (1980) 3 who notes that the scepticism with which autopsy as the basis for an historical method was viewed from the nineteenth century onwards is at least in part to blame for this: 'l'évidence avec laquelle les historiens anciens considéraient leur propre observation comme la meilleure base d'une investigation critique est devenue pour nous un "problème"'.

[71] For discussion on this topic see Momigliano (1990) and Sauer (2004).

disproportionate number of the autopsy references: twenty-seven out of the forty-seven direct eyewitness statements (including all three methodological statements) plus twenty-four out of the eighty-four other phrases. This book also demonstrates better than any other Herodotus' move to transfer the application of *opsis* from natural phenomena to historical material.

Why are there so many autopsy references in Book 2? Egypt in many ways provided the perfect case study for Herodotus to try out his investigative methods. The country had a particular fascination for the Greeks, who had been involved with it as mercenaries and traders for centuries (see Herodotus on this 'special relationship' at 2.154 and 3.139). They founded the Greek *poleis* of Naucratis and Elephantine and there must have been many well-established links between Greeks and Egyptians, making it easier for Herodotus to travel and explore the country, visit its great sites and question its inhabitants.

Herodotus gives us two reasons why Egypt was special to him personally. First, he informs his audience that the Egyptian *logos* will be long because '[Egypt] has very many wondrous features and has produced more monuments that defy description than anywhere else in the world' (ὅτι πλεῖστα θωμάσια ἔχει ἡ ἠ ἄλλη πᾶσα γῆ καὶ ἔργα λόγου μέζω παρέχεται πρὸς πᾶσαν χώρην – 2.35.1). Second, the Egyptians 'make a particular practice of recording the history of all peoples, and are consequently by far the most learned people I have come across and questioned' (μνήμην ἀνθρώπων πάντων ἐπασκέοντες μάλιστα λογιώτατοί εἰσὶ μακρῷ τῶν ἐγὼ ἐς διάπειραν ἀπικόμην – 2.77.1).

Herodotus sees Egypt as a country steeped in history (see the roll call of kings at 2.100) that shares his preoccupation with 'memory': he was likely to find good sources there. Being also, crucially, full of visible evidence, both wonders and the material remains of the past (ἔργα), it provides the ideal setting for the practice of historical investigation through empirical methods. Moreover, the majority of wonders in the *Histories* refer to physical objects (as opposed to *logoi*) and to historical remains rather than natural phenomena (as discussed below). This is not

to say that other places lacked physical data useful for Herodotus' history, but Egypt appeared to have more than anywhere else.[72]

Although it is always important to remember that Herodotus was writing in a pre-disciplinary age when subjects such as 'history' or 'geography' were not clearly defined, the methodological statement at 2.99 is widely viewed by scholars as a watershed in the book, dividing the first half, which predominantly contains geographic and ethnographic material, from the second, which mostly deals with Egyptian history. Thus it is of great importance for the current discussion that Herodotus distinguishes between his sources here, citing *opsis*, *gnome* and *historie* as sources for the first half of the book, and *akoe* supplemented by *opsis* for the second.

Herodotus does not of course stick to this rigid distinction – see, e.g., 2.104, 2.116, 2.120, 2.135, 2.145-6 for examples of *gnome* post 2.99, and 2.2-5, 2.32 for examples of *akoe* pre 2.99. But *opsis* is the only source he explicitly names at 2.99 as relevant to both parts of the book, and he does so again at 2.147.1 where he starts to include the accounts of people other than Egyptians, but still supplemented by *opsis* (τῆς ἐμῆς ὄψιος).[73] *Opsis* is, therefore, the only source Herodotus claims to use throughout Book 2, and the statement at 2.99 marks the changeover from *opsis* applied to natural phenomena to *opsis* applied to history.

This can clearly be seen by a closer look at the direct eyewitness statements in Book 2. What immediately leaps out is that all of those before 2.99 (with one exception – see below) refer to natural phenomena, whereas all of those after 2.99 refer to historical material.[74] Moreover, the second half of the book contains the majority of these statements: seventeen as opposed to the first half's nine. In the first half, we find Herodotus using *opsis* to discover more about the geographical landscape of Egypt (2.8), its marine past (2.5, 2.10, 2.12), its soil composition

[72] For further discussion on the importance of Egypt for Herodotus' methods of enquiry, see Luraghi (2001b) 152-3.

[73] See Chapter 3 (section 3.2). Cartledge and Greenwood (2002) 335 comment on 2.99: 'it is noteworthy that, even in relation to stories for which he cannot vouch, Herodotus does not relinquish his authorial guarantee altogether'. Cf., for example, Thomas (2000) 164-5.

[74] The only exception in the second half is the island of Chemmis and Herodotus' denial that he saw it move (2.155-6).

(2.12), and animal life (2.73, 2.75) whether real or mythical. The only exception is the investigation into the origins of Heracles at 2.43-5, one of the most exciting passages for revealing the development of Herodotus' methods of enquiry.

Herodotus is trying to discover whether the cult of Heracles was brought from Egypt to Greece or *vice versa*. As one might expect for an historical investigation, he starts with *akoe* – Egyptian stories (λόγον ἤκουσα – 2.43.1) about Heracles which suggest he came from Egypt originally – but is dissatisfied with this. He then uses *gnome* to propose a series of arguments showing that this view is the correct one (ἐμὴ γνώμη – 2.43.3). But he is still not satisfied because he really wants to *know* the answer (θέλων δὲ τούτων πέρι σαφές τι εἰδέναι) and so he travels to Tyre and Thasos to see the Phoenician temples of Heracles which prove to be older than the worship of Heracles in Greece, according to the visual evidence and the testimony of the priests (ἔπλευσα ... εἶδον; εἶδον ... ἀπικόμην). After this 'tricolon crescendo' of sources, Herodotus is finally satisfied and sums up the whole process as τὰ … ἱστορημένα (2.44.1-5).

This passage clearly demonstrates Herodotus' thought-process in trying to apply *opsis* to an historical rather than 'scientific' enquiry.[75] It is that thirst for knowledge – θέλων … εἰδέναι – which drives him to go beyond the conventional source for the past (the Homeric *akoe* or oral tradition) and attempt to use rational argument (*gnome*) and ultimately *opsis* to tackle (and solve) an historical problem. This is a truly extraordinary achievement and original cognitive leap, especially if one considers that Herodotus was living in a predominantly oral society without the benefit of modern archaeological methods, and that among his contemporaries *opsis* was associated with natural philosophy and medical enquiry.

Having demonstrated to his audience in this passage how *opsis* can be usefully employed for history-writing, he is then in a position to exploit it to the full in the second half of Book 2, the focus of which is Egyptian history. Here we find Herodotus using *opsis* to support or disprove oral accounts of past events: he confirms the extent of Sesostris' military expeditions as related to him by the

[75] See Lesher (2008) 468 on σαφές εἰδέναι referring to knowledge gained through firsthand observation. He uses this passage at 2.44 to argue that the phrase has the same meaning in Xenophanes.

priests of Hephaestus in Memphis by explaining he has seen the commemorative pillars left behind by Sesostris in Palestinian Syria (αὐτὸς ὥρων ἐούσας – 2.106.1), Scythia and Thrace (ἐν … τῇ τούτων χώρῃ φαίνονται – 2.103.1); he rejects another story heard in Sais that the hands on the wooden female statues in the palace were chopped off by Mycerinus' wife because having seen the statues and their hands it was clear that the passage of time was responsible for their removal (ταῦτα γὰρ ὦν καὶ ἡμεῖς ὡρῶμεν … ἐφαίνοντο ἐοῦσαι ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμέ – 2.131.3).

Herodotus closely examines and even measures monuments such as Cheops' and Chephren's pyramids to learn about the past, and absorbs the information about labourers' rations from a notice on Cheops' pyramid read out to him by his translator (ὁ ἑρμηνεύς μοι ἐπιλεγόμενος τὰ γράμματα ἔφη – 2.125.6). He expresses wonder at the beauty of temples and monuments built by past Egyptian kings which testify to their greatness – the temple built out of a single block of stone at Buto (τὸ δέ μοι τῶν φανερῶν ἦν θῶμα μέγιστον – 2.155.3), or a chamber constructed in the same way by Amasis at Sais (θωμάζω – 2.175.3). He even examines the remains of slipways by the Red Sea as evidence of Necho's trireme-building (τῶν ἔτι οἱ ὁλκοί εἰσι δῆλοι – 2.159.1). The fact that Herodotus was not always correct in the conclusions he drew from these observations does not negate his belief in, and promotion of, an empirical method to learn about historical events.[76]

Sometimes it is the sheer quantity of autopsy references which stands out, for example in his description of the labyrinth by Lake Moeris which for Herodotus is proof of the Egyptians' monument-building habit, always with an eye on posterity: τῶν ἐγὼ ἤδη εἶδον λόγου μέζω ... αὐτοί τε ὡρῶμεν διεξιόντες καὶ αὐτοὶ θεησάμενοι λέγομεν ... αὐτοὶ ὡρῶμεν (2.148). Here autopsy also gives Herodotus the status to relate the labyrinth's wonders and history to his audience (θεησάμενοι λέγομεν): it is a guarantee of truth. None of this is to deny that in Book 2, as elsewhere in the *Histories*, *akoe* forms the basis of historical enquiry and the main source for knowledge about the past. But having argued for a 'hierarchy of epistemological factors' with *opsis* at the top, Herodotus is keen to apply this to historical enquiry

[76] See further the discussion in Chapter 2.

wherever possible in order to advance his knowledge further, given his dissatisfaction with the reliability of *akoe* as a source.[77]

To return to the methodological statement at 2.99, this development is possibly reflected by the way in which *opsis* is added as a source for Egyptian history almost as an afterthought: 'from now on I will be relating Egyptian accounts. But this will be supplemented by what I personally saw' (προσέσται δὲ τι αὐτοῖσί καὶ τῆς ἐμῆς ὄψιος). He uses exactly the same language at 2.147.1: 'now I will report other accounts ... But this will be supplemented by what I personally saw' (προσέσται δέ τι αὐτοῖσι καὶ τῆς ἐμῆς ὄψιος). It is as though Herodotus anticipates that a contemporary audience will associate *opsis* with natural phenomena and *akoe* with an historical enquiry and so decides to draw their attention to this new use of *opsis* by adding an additional emphatic phrase. His choice of style thus reflects the early days of a transition in the use of *opsis* from scientific enquiry to history.

Book 2 is highly illustrative both of the importance of *opsis* to Herodotus' historical investigations and his originality in creating this prominent role for it. But other books of the *Histories* also exhibit this, and the discussion will now turn to his application of *opsis* in the historical field throughout the work.[78] If Herodotus wanted to use *opsis* to learn about the past, he had to establish what was physically left of the past for him to examine. Sanctuary dedications, commemorative monuments, and tombs were obvious subjects. Dedications in sanctuaries across the Greek and non-Greek world were common and Herodotus was clearly reliant on the priests and records in temples for much of his research, so it is no surprise that a considerable number of autopsy references are to temples and their dedications: twelve out of the forty-seven direct eyewitness statements and forty-four out of eighty-four other phrases.

He finds evidence of Croesus' close connections with the Greek world in the numerous dedications he sent to Greek temples: the gold and silver bowls (which

[77] Quote from Marincola (1997) 96. See also Raaflaub (2002) 159 in his discussion on Herodotus' sources and their contemporary context.

[78] But the reduction in eyewitness statements in the later books (especially 7-9) has been noticed by scholars. This may be due to the fact that these books are concerned with recent Greek history, and therefore events more familiar to the audience, so Herodotus feels less need to use *opsis* to prove that they took place. For more on this issue see Chapter 2.

so impressed Herodotus: οὐ γὰρ τὸ συντυχὸν φαίνεταί μοι ἔργον εἶναι – 1.51.3) and golden lion at Delphi (καὶ νῦν κεῖται – 1.50.3), the gold shield and spear to Amphiaraus in Thebes (τὰ ἀμφότερα ἐς ἐμὲ ἦν ἔτι καὶ κείμενα – 1.52), and the gold he gave the Spartans for their statue of Apollo in Thornax, Laconia (τὸ νῦν … ἵδρυται – 1.69.4). But with characteristic precision, Herodotus also distinguishes between those of Croesus' dedications he has seen and those he has not: whereas he has viewed the golden tripod in Thebes, golden cows and pillars at Ephesus, and golden shield at Delphi (ταῦτα μὲν καὶ ἔτι ἐς ἐμὲ ἦν περιεόντα – 1.92.1), he has only heard about those at Branchidae in Miletus as these were destroyed by the Persians during the Ionian Revolt (τὰ δ' ἐν Βραγχίδῃσι … ὡς ἐγὼ πυνθάνομαι – 1.92.2).[79]

This use of temple dedications to prove the veracity of reported events can be found throughout the *Histories*. The rocks which destroyed the invading Persians at Delphi are still preserved in the sanctuary (ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἠμέας ἦσαν σόοι – 8.39.2), while the Athenian victory over the Chalcidians and Boeotians at the end of the turbulent sixth century BC is evidenced by the chains used to bind the prisoners and the bronze chariot victory dedication, both visible on the acropolis at Athens (ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἦσαν περιεοῦσαι ... ἀριστερῆς χειρὸς ἕστηκε πρῶτον ἐσιόντι – 5.77.3-4). Likewise the abundance of iron spits dedicated at Delphi by Rhodopis and still on show behind the Chian altar is proof for Herodotus of this infamous prostitute's wealth: 'for to this day it is still possible for anyone wishing to do so to see/know to what a tenth of her fortune amounted' (τῆς γὰρ τὴν δεκάτην τῶν χρημάτων ἰδέσθαι ἔστὶ ἔτι καὶ ἐς τόδε παντὶ τῷ βουλομένῳ – 2.135.3).

Commemorative (but non-sanctuary) dedications have a similar purpose, from the bowl representing the size of the Scythian population constructed in the time of King Ariantes (4.81.2) to the *stele* in the agora at Samos recording the names of those who refused to desert the Ionian cause at the battle of Lade (6.14) or the stone lion at Thermopylae, a tribute to Leonidas (8.225). Tombs, and sometimes their inscriptions, are also good sources for historical figures. Herodotus examines those of Alyattes (1.93), Cheops and Chephren (2.124-7), the Cimmerian royal

[79] Asheri (2007) 144 notes the contrast.

family (4.11) and the Greeks who fell at Thermopylae (8.228) and Plataea (9.85), among others.

Occasionally, Herodotus uses *opsis* in a more 'technical' way, by measuring the monuments he visits. One might think that measuring is a method more relevant to analysing natural phenomena, and indeed Herodotus often gives his estimated measurements of geographical features such as the Euxine Sea (μοι μεμετρέαται – 4.86.4).[80] But he also tells us authoritatively that Cheops' pyramid was larger than Chephren's, and he knows this because he measured them both himself (ταῦτα γὰρ ὧν καὶ ἠμεῖς ἐμετρήσαμεν – 2.127.1).[81] He uses this verb μετρέω ('measure') in a slightly different sense when describing how the numbers on the plaques on Alyattes' tomb 'add up' to reveal that prostitutes did more work building it than any other group (ἐφαίνετο μετρεόμενον – 1.93.3). Herodotus is evidently not averse to employing methods normally used to analyse natural phenomena to better understand the historical monuments he has seen.

Herodotus also examines the remains of the past in a way more akin to modern archaeology. At the Pelusian mouth of the Nile he finds evidence of the early (before c. 570 BC) occupation by the Greeks who worked as mercenaries for Psammetichus, namely the remains of their houses and slipways for their ships: οἵ τε ὀλκοὶ τῶν νεῶν καὶ τὰ ἐρείπια τῶν οἰκημάτων τὸ μέχρι ἐμεῦ ἦσαν (2.154.5). Similarly, the slipways constructed on the Red Sea by Necho provide some evidence of his military ambitions: τῶν ἔτι οἱ ὀλκοί εἰσι δῆλοι (2.159.1). The physical remains of Darius' military campaign in Scythia can also be seen in the ruins of the forts he built by the River Oarus: τῶν ἔτι ἐς ἐμὲ τὰ ἐρείπια σόα ἦν (4.124.1).

Here Herodotus is trying to find the physical traces of past events and people. This appears to serve a mainly corroboratory purpose, an attempt to back up the stories he has heard with physical evidence. Certainly his methods are primitive by the standards of modern archaeological techniques. But it is important to recognise

[80] For more on this episode, see West (2003). See Corcella (2013) 56-7 on Herodotus' use of measuring to understand and 'translate' the world and its regions; Lloyd (1987) 215-84 on the use of measuring in ancient Greek science, in particular 271-4 on the connection with observation.

[81] Lloyd (2007) 333 suggests Herodotus probably made these measurements by pacing the distance along the side of the pyramids.

that Herodotus looked not just for monuments, dedications and tombs which were purposefully erected by historical figures with an eye on posterity, but also for the unintentional physical traces of their lives.

As previously mentioned, Herodotus was conducting his research in a pre-disciplinary age, and while his work may sometimes appear to us to fall neatly into 'ethnographic' or 'historical' sections, he did not necessarily see it this way. Indeed, his 'enquiry' is much more cohesive than this, with *nomoi* playing a determinative role in historical causation: it is people's customs that explain their history; the Scythians' nomadic lifestyle explains why they are unconquerable in the face of Darius' attack.[82] Part of this connection between 'history' and 'ethnography' is Herodotus' attempt to link customs practiced in his own day to historical events.

One obvious example of this is the origin of cults such as the worship of Onesilus in Amathous, Cyprus. The Amathousians instituted the cult on the advice of an oracle after observing that bees had made their honeycomb in Onesilus' head. They had cut off his head and displayed it at the entrance gate as punishment for his failed siege of the city. But Herodotus brings the story up to date by observing that his worship is still practised in his own day: νυν ἐποίευν ταῦτα καὶ τὸ μέχρι ἐμεῦ (5.115.1).[83] Similarly, the worship of the winds in Thyia is attributed to an oracle received by the Delphians in the dark days of Xerxes' invasion (ἔτι καὶ νῦν τοὺς ἀνέμους ἱλάσκονται – 7.178.2).

Herodotus also draws this connection as regards tributes and donations made to the Persians by their subject peoples. He claims that the tribute assessment system imposed by Artaphrenes after the Ionian revolt still applies (οἳ κατὰ χώρην διατελέουσι ἔχοντες ἐκ τούτου τοῦ χρόνου αἰεὶ ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ – 6.42.2), while the Ethiopians on the Egyptian border and the Colchians still make their traditional donations to the Persian king (ἀγινέουσι δὲ καὶ τὸ μέχρις ἐμεῦ; ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ …

[82] See Thomas (2000) 102-34 and Raaflaub (2002) 181-2 for further discussion on this connection; also Hartog (1988) and Gabrielsen and Lund (2007) for Herodotus and the Scythians.

[83] Hornblower (2013) 240, 298-9 suggests that this formula foreshadows aetiologies in Hellenistic poetry.

ἁγίνεον – 3.97.3-4).[84] This linking of past events to observation of present-day customs serves a dual purpose in the *Histories*: the current practice of the custom provides evidence for the historical event, while the historical event provides an explanation of the custom's origin. This mutual interdependence is further marked by the use of one of Herodotus' autopsy motif phrases every time the connection is made.

The relationship between history and custom is symptomatic of Herodotus' use of *opsis* to link the present and the past.[85] In fact, his application of *opsis* in historical investigation throughout the *Histories* is aiming for this goal, in that Herodotus uses the present-day remains to learn about the past. This brings us to another fundamental way in which Herodotus has transferred use of *opsis* from medicine and natural philosophy to historical enquiry. It has already been noted that the analogy between the visible and invisible, the attempt to extrapolate from observable phenomena to better understand the unobservable, is much in evidence in the work of contemporary Hippocratic writers, and is a methodology to which Herodotus sometimes subscribes.

But the greatest 'invisible' subject is surely the past itself: as Thomas puts it, 'the stuff of history would be as much a part of the "invisible" for Herodotus as the wastes of northern Scythia'.[86] Yet by applying *opsis* to history, Herodotus has in fact attempted to draw the past into the visible realm. For in observing and interpreting the material (visible) remains of the past, he has reached conclusions about the actual (invisible) past events themselves. Mari encapsulates this point in her discussion of the dedications and inscriptions at Delphi. As she describes it, these objects 'stimulate a mental journey ... the one leading, so to say, "from visible to invisible"'.[87] Moreover, viewing historical objects provides the impulse to the

[84] Other examples of this connection would be the practice of Argive and Aeginetan women to wear longer broaches (5.88.3), the presence of Callias' descendants in Croton (5.45.2), and the presence of Eretrians in Ardericca, Cissia (6.119.4).

[85] Marincola (2006) 17 has highlighted the originality of Herodotus in recognising a causal link between past and present: 'he is the first to connect the present with the past in an *analytic* manner'.

[86] Thomas (2000) 172.

[87] Mari (2013) 127. See, however, Corcella (2013) 47-9 who argues that as past events are not directly subject to vision, *opsis* can only play a role secondary to other sources in an historical

historian to wonder at and try to reconstruct the 'invisible' historical narrative behind these remains.[88]

It is difficult, therefore, to agree with Thomas that (as regards the visible/invisible analogy), 'it is for problems of natural phenomena that this method is articulated'.[89] In attempting to learn about unobservable historical events through observations of their physical present-day traces, Herodotus arguably conducted the most significant experiment in the use of the visible/invisible analogy of his time.[90] This is where the differences between Herodotus and his contemporaries become clear. He has taken *opsis* from its familiar role in advancing knowledge of medicine and natural philosophy and employed it for an historical investigation. He applies it to assess the veracity of *akoe* (the traditional source for history), provide evidence for past events, attest to the wealth, power or hubris of historical figures, give customs an historical framework, or just marvel at the ἔργα μεγάλα τε καὶ θωμαστά, the witnesses of human achievement.

Many scholars are keen to attribute originality to the 'father of history': 'he discovered the problem of sources';[91] was first to apply the problem of sources to the *past*;[92] 'the first writer to apply ... "inquiry" to the study of the human past';[93] the first to apply the prevailing critical attitude of his day to the study of the past;[94] the first to write about history on this scale at all.[95] But few, if any, fully recognise his revolutionary application of *opsis* to historical investigation or that *opsis* plays a

---

investigation, being used to confirm information provided by *akoe* (a function which was explored in Chapter 3). Yet Corcella also admits (49) that the Herodotean approach to the past involves 'a substantial empiricism'.

[88] Mari (2013) 128-9.

[89] Thomas (2000) 201.

[90] A similar argument could be made as regards Herodotus' use of *gnome*. Just as it is used by the Hippocratics (and Herodotus) to discuss invisible natural phenomena, so too Herodotus uses it to discuss historical problems where *opsis* is simply not possible or insufficient, for example at 2.43, 5.22, 5.45, 7.139, 7.214, and 7.220.

[91] Fowler (1996) 86.

[92] Thomas (2000) 272.

[93] Fowler (2006) 32.

[94] van Wees (2002) 349.

[95] Raaflaub (2002) 164.

far more significant role in his historical as opposed to the ethnographical and geographical enquiry. Those who have done so merely touch on it and move on.[96]

What prompted Herodotus to make this inspired borrowing? As far as we can tell from extant fragments, in the Western world at least, no one had tried to research and write about the past at this level before: most scholars agree that the *Histories* is unprecedented in its chronological and geographical scope, length, and painstaking use of sources.[97] So perhaps it was the very act of researching the past on this scale that prompted Herodotus to use *opsis* in this way. His travels and discussions with temple priests possibly showed him just how many visible traces of the past remained, while his acute awareness of the limitations of *akoe* (especially as regards verifiability) led him to adopt new methods.[98]

This evolutionary thought-process is most evident in Book 2, with 2.99 marking the changeover to *opsis* applied to historical rather than geographical or ethnographical investigation, while the desire for knowledge about past events is given as the reason for the use of travel and *opsis* as historical tools (2.43-5). Indeed, the ultimate riposte to the sceptical school of thought on Herodotus, as epitomised by Fehling, might be that Herodotus would not have thought of using *opsis* in this way had he not travelled and seen for himself how important material remains are for the writing of history. In defiance of the 'invisible' nature of history, Herodotus demonstrated that it is possible to be a 'spectator of the past'.

---

[96] Lateiner (1986) 14, in his comparison of the empirical method of Herodotus and the Hippocratics, comments: 'Herodotus may claim an original application of a method developed in another field. It was an inspired borrowing that drew history away from the vast and vain temporal and geographical speculations of Hecataeus towards the systematic investigation of the recent past through the only available witnesses, human survivors and material monuments'. He does not, however, develop this argument. Thomas (2006) 72-3 accepts that '[Herodotus'] marriage of the methods and style of contemporary science to the subject of past history was the product of his own originality', but she does not allow his use of *opsis* a role in this.

[97] See Fowler (1990) and (2006) for discussion of 'historians' before and contemporary with Herodotus. He still concludes that in the scale of his ambition for historical enquiry, Herodotus is unprecedented.

[98] See Schepens (1980) 83-4 and 90-3 on Herodotus as the first to develop a methodology of historical enquiry based on autopsy.

6.4: Herodotus 'in Context'?

So far I have argued that while the *Histories* has much in common with the empirical methods advocated by the Hippocratics and (to some extent) the early Presocratics, Herodotus' originality lies in applying *opsis* to historical subjects and attempting to bring the past into the visible realm. But his move can also be understood as part of broader trend in the *Histories* to take subjects away from their more traditional context and include them among historical data. One obvious example is the role of θῶμα ('wonder') in the work.

From the fifth century BC, wonders appear to be part of the investigation into the natural world for the natural philosophers: both Democritus and (possibly, though unlikely) Aristotle apparently contributed works on the wonders of nature.[99] 'Wonders' meant bizarre animals, incredible geographic features, or other anomalies of nature. Herodotus contributes to this genre, commenting on the amazing Arabian sheep with their exceptionally long or broad tails (θώματος ἄξια – 3.113.1) or the river Peneius and its earthquake-made ravine which so astonished Xerxes (ἐν θώματι μεγάλῳ ἐνέσχετο – 7.128.2). Yet his use of wonders covers a much broader spectrum: of the thirty-six occurrences of the word θῶμα in the text, seven refer to natural phenomena, three to human customs or activities, three to divine miracles, seventeen to historical events and six to historical (man-made) objects.[100]

The embankment built along the Euphrates (1.185), the intricate passages of the Egyptian labyrinth (2.148), and the remarkable bravery of the Spartans Sperthias and Bulis (7.135) were all included in Herodotus' θῶματα. Indeed, the scope of his concept of wonder is encapsulated by the use of the word to cover both natural phenomena and historical monuments, as at 1.93 where the gold dust from Mount

[99] Democritus DK 68A99a; a text *On Marvellous Things Heard* has traditionally been attributed to Aristotle.

[100] Natural phenomena: 1.68; 3.12; 3.23; 3.113 (twice); 4.129; 7.128. Customs: 1.68; 4.111; 4.199. Divine miracles: 8.37; 8.135 (twice). Historical events: 1.23; 3.3; 5.92; 6.43; 6.177; 6.121; 6.123; 7.99; 7.135; 7.153; 7.187 (twice); 7.218; 8.74; 9.11; 9.37; 9.65. Historical objects: 1.93 (though also includes gold dust); 1.185; 1.194; 2.148; 2.149; 2.155. The adjectives θωμάσιος and θώματος cover a similarly broad range.

Tmolus and Alyattes' tomb are both included in Lydia's marvels.[101] For Herodotus, wonders were part of the investigation into the past as well as the natural world: his enquiry covers ἔργα μεγάλα τε καὶ θωμαστά, i.e., the great and marvellous achievements of men.

There is also a link here with Herodotus' use of *opsis*, given that θῶμα is etymologically connected to words for seeing such as θεῶμαι. When a wonder is a physical phenomenon, it is to be gazed upon and marvelled at: Herodotus looks at the wonders of the labyrinth (αὐτοὶ θεησάμενοι ... θῶμα – 2.148.5-6), or Xerxes examines the Peneius (ἐθεήσατο ... ἐν θώματι – 7.128.2). Therefore the inclusion of historical events and objects among wonders may serve to draw attention to this new application of *opsis* to historical research.

The inclusion of such a broad spectrum of phenomena among a catalogue of wonders appears unprecedented, and possibly the traces of a more traditional categorisation, equating θῶματα with the natural world and ἔργα with the human, can be found at 2.35. Here Herodotus writes of Egypt as having πλεῖστα θωμάσια … καὶ ἔργα λόγου μέζω (2.35.1) which seems to imply a separation between marvels on the one hand and human achievements on the other. But as the above examples show, Herodotus was keen to demonstrate that human achievements and man-made objects could also be wonders.

Another area in which Herodotus has made this transition is in his portrayal of the 'barbarians' or non-Greek peoples.[102] At some point in the late sixth or early fifth century BC, there appears to have been 'a sudden shift from hazy and loosely organised ideas about what it meant to be Greek to an oppositional identity based on cultural criteria', as Skinner has described it; albeit interactions with, and definitions of self-identity against, non-Greek peoples were much more widespread in the Greek world before this period than has traditionally been understood.[103]

---

[101] 2.156 is another example.

[102] For an overview and discussion of Herodotus' attitudes towards *barbaroi* see Hall (1989), Harrison (2002) and (2015a), Isaac (2004), Skinner (2013) 238-48.

[103] Skinner (2013) 234-57 argues for a much more gradual process of self-identification in the Greek world against non-Greek peoples in the context of understanding the development of Greek

Vlassopoulos has also argued that the Persian Wars should not be seen as a watershed moment which created a Greek identity out of opposition to non-Greeks; a mixture of polarity and cultural exchange between Greeks and barbarians is present in both material culture and literature from Homer onwards.[104] Rather, we should see this period as creating the intensification of a process of differentiation: the Persian Wars were 'a catalyst that sped up an already existing process, heightened interest, and contributed new means and media for representing the foreigner in both literature and art'.[105]

Nevertheless by the mid-fifth century BC there is undoubtedly a negative view of non-Greek peoples to be found in Greek literature and it is in this context that Herodotus' attitudes to barbarians stand out. Likewise, Thomas has argued that the view of barbarians in the Hippocratic texts is very different from the negative stereotypes characteristic of fifth-century BC Athenian writers. Works such as *Airs*, which (to a certain extent) posits an environmental determinism to explain human health, make connections across the whole human world regardless of *ethnos*.[106]

Herodotus shares this more balanced view, but once again applies it to human deeds, not just medicine or ethnography. He is happy to praise non-Greek monuments, such as the Egyptian labyrinth, above Greek: 'if someone put together all the strongholds and public monuments of the Greeks, it would be obvious that less labour and money had been expended on them than on this labyrinth' (2.148.2);[107] is highly dismissive of Greek historical accounts: 'the Greek account of

---

ethnographic prose writing. This contrasts with the more traditional view represented by Hall (1989) 51: 'The non-Greeks of archaic literature did not perform the central function of the barbarians in the fifth century and beyond, that of anti-Greeks against whom Hellenic culture and character were defined'. For more on Greek perceptions of barbarians at this time see, for example, Pelling (1997a) and Harrison (2002). Kim (2013) still recognises the development of a Greek-barbarian antithesis but attributes its origin to the Ionian resistance to Persia at the end of the sixth century BC.

[104] Vlassopoulos (2013a), especially 161-225, and (2013b).

[105] Vlassopoulos (2013a) 188.

[106] Thomas (2000) 70.

[107] εἰ γάρ τις τὰ ἐξ Ἑλλήνων τείχεά τε καὶ ἔργων ἀπόδεξιν συλλογίσαιτο, ἐλάσσονος πόνου τε ἂν καὶ δαπάνης φανείη ἐόντα τοῦ λαβυρίνθου τούτου

Heracles' birth is far from being the only thoughtless thing they say' (2.45.1);[108] and is firm in his belief that Darius and his conspirators did consider instituting democracy in Persia (3.80-3) – a radical view for his time.

It is true that from the proem onwards (τὰ μὲν Ἕλλησι, τὰ δὲ βαρβάροισι), Herodotus maintains the distinction between Greek and barbarian, but this is arguably more a convention than a reflection of a genuine historical and cultural antithesis. Just as Herodotus is highly critical of contemporary map-drawing and the names given to the continents, yet decides to use the standard names (4.36-45), he adheres to the conventional terms for, and separation of, Greek and non-Greek peoples: he is always aware of the need to persuade his audience. His acknowledgment that few will believe the Persian constitutional debate took place (3.80; 6.43) shows that he understood just how controversial were his views.

This relaxation of the anti-barbarian stereotype when discussing the historical and cultural achievements of Greeks and non-Greeks alike is apparently unique among Herodotus' contemporaries, from the occasional tirades of Athenian tragedy to the more considered climactic theories of the Hippocratics. As Luraghi has pointed out, we should perhaps be more cautious before labelling Herodotus an 'old-fashioned fellow' for any archaic tendencies he may have.[109] This more open and objective view of non-Greek peoples may have been inspired by Herodotus' historical research on the archaic period and travel in the non-Greek world, which gave him a different perspective on human achievement. Whatever the reason, he was clearly determined to apply to his historical investigation this more nuanced approach towards the 'barbarian'.

It is time to return to the question posed at the beginning of this chapter: does Herodotus' use of *opsis* in the context of contemporary enquiries suggest he was merely participating in the debates of his day or doing something radically different? It has already been argued that by applying an empirical method and a more nuanced view of the non-Greek world to historical investigation and

[108] λέγουσι δὲ πολλὰ καὶ ἄλλα ἀνεπισκέπτως οἱ Ἕλληνες: εὐήθης δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ ὅδε ὁ μῦθός ἐστι τὸν περὶ τοῦ Ἡρακλέος λέγουσι

[109] Luraghi (2006) 79.

including historical events and achievements among a catalogue of wonders, the *Histories* represents a radical departure from other fifth-century BC works.

Furthermore, though in his polemical style, choice of language, and persistent authorial interventions, Herodotus sits comfortably within the lively intellectual milieu of his Hippocratic colleagues, when it comes to their ideas he is less than complimentary.[110] As Thomas has illustrated, Herodotus largely rejects their theories of continental and environmental determinism in favour of a *nomos*-based explanation of ethnography and history.[111] He is likewise highly critical of 'Ionian' geographical theories (e.g., 2.15-6; 2.20-3; 4.36-42), his targets most likely contemporary writers, in Thomas' view.[112]

More generally, his less prejudiced view of the non-Greek world goes against the trend in the fifth century BC, and later led him to be branded a *philobarbarus* by Plutarch.[113] Nor does he shy away from expressing highly controversial opinions, such as his possible doubts about Athenian autochthony (1.56-8) or his claim that it was the Athenians who saved Greece from the Persian threat ('an opinion that will offend a lot of people': γνώμην … ἐπίφθονον μὲν πρὸς τῶν πλεόνων ἀνθρώπων – 7.139.1).

What one ultimately takes away from a close comparison of Herodotus and his contemporaries are not so much their similarities but rather the differences between them, which highlight just how revolutionary Herodotus was. It is of course right to view him as a contributor to the contemporary intellectual culture which promoted debate on new theories in a polemical style to better understand the world and man's place in it.

But Herodotus participated in this milieu largely in order to distance himself from its ideas and apply its methods to other fields of enquiry. Nowhere is this more

---

[110] See Laskaris (2002) 84 and Dewald (2002) for more on the importance of first-person statements in the rhetorical style of the Hippocratics and Herodotus respectively.

[111] Thomas (2000) 67-8; 80; 86-101; 104-5.

[112] Thomas (2000) 80. Herodotus criticises the Ionians more generally throughout the work. See also 2.143; 3.115-6; 4.53; his account of the Ionian revolt in Books 5 and 6 is considered to be critical of its shambolic planning and execution.

[113] Plutarch, *On the Malignity of Herodotus*, 12.

striking than in his use of *opsis*, demonstrating how an empirical method can be successfully employed to analyse the material remains of the past and further our knowledge of history. Laying the foundations of multi-disciplinary historical research is perhaps Herodotus' true legacy to today's historian: marrying material evidence to oral/textual testimony and providing a detailed critique of these different sources to recreate as truthful an historical narrative as possible. In that he was very modern.

Chapter 7
Conclusion

'Historians are the mediators between the past and the present. We are in being and in business to understand people and events in time, and to communicate that understanding to a wider audience, by our teaching, by our writing, and by our broader participation in the public realm.'[1]

David Cannadine

In many ways David Cannadine's description of the role of the twenty-first-century historian is equally apt for Herodotus. Essentially, the task of the historian is a didactic one: to research the past and then to communicate that information to a present-day audience in a way that will enable them to understand and relate to past events, but also to form their own interpretations of history. Herodotus fulfils this role through his multi-source *historie*; via both the oral performance (originally) and written communication of his work, he demonstrates how to conduct an investigation and encourages his audience to form their own opinions.

This thesis has sought to explore fully the use of *opsis* in the *Histories*, both as a tool for Herodotus as an investigator and as a rich component in the narrative, and in doing so to reveal the pivotal role *opsis* plays in establishing that communication between past and present.

7.1: Metanarrative – Chapters 2 and 3

The database of authorial autopsy references established in Chapter 2 via a close analysis of the text revealed that these are much more extensive than scholars have appreciated, probably because they have tended to focus on direct references only. Significantly, the majority of these references are in fact indirect, with Herodotus often using his 'motif phrases' to indicate that his autopsy is present. In this, I have argued that Herodotus is creating a new language of autopsy for the investigator, a way of signalling his authorial guarantee based on *opsis* without interrupting the narrative. This technique would be picked up by later writers conducting similar investigations, such as Pausanias.

[1] Cannadine (1987) 169.

The credibility of Herodotus' claims to autopsy has also been examined. Fehling's theory that the source-citations in the *Histories* were invented by Herodotus and that he could not have seen the things he claims to have seen produces an unsatisfactory and inconsistent view of the text. The criticisms of those scholars such as Fehling, Armayor and West who have questioned the veracity of Herodotus' autopsy references tend to stem from an attempt to impose modern methodological standards and concepts of truth on ancient historiography and can often be refuted by a close examination of the relevant textual passages.

As demonstrated in the discussion of 4.81, 2.75, 6.74.2 and 9.81.1, many of Herodotus' apparent inaccuracies and mistakes should be re-examined in light of the contrast he repeatedly (if not always explicitly) makes between information obtained from *akoe* as opposed to *opsis*. Ultimately, however, the question of authorial credibility stands separately from the new understanding of *opsis* as the basis of Herodotus' sophisticated investigative methodology that has been developed in this thesis.

We have seen that autopsy is highly significant for Herodotus as an investigative tool in the metanarrative, especially as regards its relationship with his other sources. A close analysis of the important programmatic statement at 2.99.1 (together with similar statements at 2.29.1 and 2.147.1), where Herodotus sets out the key components of his methodology, namely ἀκοὴ (hearsay), ὄψις (personal observation), γνώμη (opinion/judgement/reasoning) and ἱστορίη (questioning of informants), reveals *opsis* as the most trustworthy method of acquiring knowledge. In particular, I have argued that at 2.99.1, far from downplaying *opsis* as a route to knowledge about historical events, Herodotus is drawing our attention to the fact that it can be used to investigate the past, despite the obvious limitation that personal contemporary eyewitness of past events is impossible.

In this context, *opsis* has three key functions: to add information or enrich a description; to confirm that information supplied by another source or investigative method is true; or to refute or cast doubt on such information. It is therefore in large part a check on the other sources, emphasising its superior nature as a way to access knowledge and the role of autopsy as an authorial guarantee of accuracy. Contributing to these functions is the denial of autopsy,

which occurs five times in the text, further underlining the importance to Herodotus of distinguishing between his sources; by contrast, in several places he shows that where *akoe* is the only source this places limitations on knowledge.

Direct statements of autopsy are used for information that is controversial, unbelievable, or to contradict prevailing or rival theories, for example, on the origins of the cult of Heracles (2.44) or the fact that the Phoenicians brought the alphabet to Greece (5.59). By contrast, indirect statements such as the motif phrases and present tense descriptions of physical objects are only used to add to or confirm evidence from other sources, not refute it. This suggests that these indirect statements form a shorthand developed by Herodotus where he only needs to show that *opsis* has performed a corroboratory role.

The greater concentration of autopsy references in the earlier books (Book 2 – the Egyptian account – in particular) and concerning non-Greek subjects is explicable by reason of a Greek audience's lack of familiarity with the material and subjects covered (as opposed to the Persian War narrative in Books 7 to 9) as well as Herodotus' desire to distinguish himself from predecessors such as Hecataeus who had covered similar ground. Where autopsy references do relate to material in the Greek world, these tend to be indirect statements.

Herodotus wants to show that *opsis* is a vital tool for enquiry, and in particular for an historical investigation, given that much can be learnt by examining the material remains of the past such as monuments, temple dedications, inscriptions and other physical remains of human activity. Furthermore, *opsis* plays a crucial role in establishing an authorial persona and authority to speak on the subjects under discussion, which in turn strengthens the didactic nature of the text. *Opsis* is also used to highlight important objects, places or events and in this sense can be seen as the Herodotean *kleos*.

However, there are a few passages in the text that provide a more nuanced view of the relationship between *opsis* and *akoe*, where *akoe* is used to explain something seen (3.12) or even to refute visual evidence (9.85). Herodotus implies that the investigator needs more than *opsis* alone for a successful enquiry: a certain amount of intelligent interpretation is also required to get the most out of *opsis* as a source.

7.2: Narrative – Chapters 4 and 5

The analysis of *opsis* in the narrative tells us as much about Herodotus' relationship with it as does the metanarrative, but it also complicates, deepens and enriches the picture. Several characters demonstrate a problematic relationship with *opsis* by misinterpreting visual evidence, attempting but failing to employ *opsis* for personal gain or desiring to see too much.

Dreams in Greek culture are powerful visual experiences (especially epiphany dreams) and play a significant role in the Herodotean narrative. In every instance, the dreamer misinterprets or ignores the message of the dream or fails to understand its full significance. Herodotus emphasises the irony that often the actions which the dreamer takes to avoid the event foretold by the dream are the very deeds which ensure its fulfilment. This in turn demonstrates clear links between the text and contemporary Greek tragedy, particularly Sophocles' *Oedipus*.

Given the inability of characters to escape the events forewarned in dreams (as best exemplified by the Xerxes/Artabanus dream sequence at the beginning of Book 7) which seems to render them pointless, the purpose of dreams can seem puzzling. Dreams appear to act as markers of significant events but also can tell us much about how Herodotus perceives the interplay between the human and divine realms and the balance between fate and individual responsibility in the causation of events – ultimately, dreams are a way for the gods to ensure that fate is fulfilled while allowing a certain degree of human autonomy in determining how exactly that fate plays out.

The sight of something or the misinterpretation of visual evidence often provides the trigger for dramatic action or the hinge on which the narrative turns (usually with negative consequences for at least one of the parties). Key examples are the Gyges and Candaules episode in Book 1 and the fall of Polycrates, tyrant of Samos, in Book 3. In particular, these stories highlight the dangers of relying on another's *opsis*, such as Astyages sending Harpagus to confirm that the baby Cyrus is dead (1.108-112), or Polycrates trusting Maeandrius' examination of the gold which the Persian Oreotes had sent to him as a sign of his good intentions (3.123-5).

Herodotus is particularly interested in strong desires in relation to *opsis*, specifically the desire to see 'too much'. Xerxes proves the richest example of this with his constant impulse to look at things (at the remains of Troy, at his army and fleet, at Greek scenery). This in turn feeds into a much broader theme in Greek culture of the dangers of ἔρως, found in authors such as Thucydides and the Greek tragedians. One of the key themes of the *Histories* are the negative consequences of breaching boundaries, whether those be geographical, cultural or familial; arguably, there is also an '*opsis* boundary' which should not be breached. There is even a hint here that an attempt to see, and therefore know, everything is to encroach on divine space for (as we know from Homer) only the gods have that ability. The exceeding of limits set by gods on men is met with divine punishment.

The failure of visual propaganda, most notably Xerxes' attempt to disguise the number of Persian dead at Thermopylae (8.25), and other key misinterpretations of the visual such as Mardonius' reaction to the apparent Greek retreat at Plataea (9.58) and Croesus' failure to understand the omen of the horses and the snakes (1.78), seem to portend the protagonist's downfall. Yet as in Greek culture generally, blindness is also linked to an inner vision and access to divine knowledge which is beyond the reach of sighted humans.

The interim conclusion reached is that although these numerous examples of misinterpretation or misunderstanding of *opsis* are to some extent purely a narrative device for Herodotus, they also pose questions about both the reliability of visual evidence and the skills needed to interpret it correctly.

However, there are several characters in the narrative who successfully interpret visual evidence or are able to harness *opsis* for their own gain – the 'masters of *opsis*'. Visual deceptions such as Peisistratus' return to Athens escorted by 'Athena' (1.60) or Zopyrus' self-mutilation which tricks the Babylonians into thinking that he has been mistreated by Cyrus (3.154-60) are highly effective. The success of a visual deception is facilitated by the very fact that people trust eyes more than ears, an irony which Herodotus exploits. These episodes also allow Herodotus to weave into the narrative key themes such as contemporary attitudes to growing Athenian power, the rise and fall of empires and the role of gods in human affairs.

Visual propaganda and military tactics are successful in the hands of Greeks: the parading of Persian commander Masistius' corpse (9.25.1), Pausanias' comparison of the Spartan and Persian feasts (9.82), or the 'retreat' of the Spartans at Thermopylae (7.112.3). This can be seen as a symbol of Greek success in the Persian War, but contrasts with indications towards the end of Book 9 that Athenian imperialism in its 'barbarian' tendencies may be heading towards dangerously hubristic territory.

Given the links between seeing and knowledge, it is not surprising to find that preventing the exercise of *opsis* can be used as a form of control. Both Deioces and the false Smerdis use their visual concealment to consolidate and maintain power, denying their subjects knowledge as to the nature of that power. This is mirrored in the metanarrative by the lack of eyewitness testimony of, and therefore knowledge about, a region such as the far north of Europe or India, contributing to the belief that it is mysterious or fantastical in some way.

More generally, characters such as Solon and Lichas provide examples of how to interpret visual evidence successfully while Zopyrus and Gobryas demonstrate the value of, and greater knowledge obtained by, seeing for oneself and not relying on another's autopsy. Particularly interesting are characters (usually tyrants or kings) such as Proteus and Periander who demonstrate enquiring methods similar to those of Herodotus: Proteus during his investigation of Alexander's alleged abduction of Helen (2.113-5) and Periander while questioning the sailors about their conduct in relation to transporting the singer Arion (1.24) – both use *opsis* to get to the truth of the matter. This pattern of 'rival' enquirers in the text provides prototypes of Herodotean methodology in action.

Opsis also has a clear commemorative function as characters use physical monuments, sanctuary dedications and inscriptions to record their deeds and perpetuate their memory. This provides a direct link with the metanarrative (many of these objects are viewed by Herodotus) as well as a bridge between past and present: characters attempt to influence how they will be perceived by future generations who in turn use those objects to try to learn about the past. Greek dedications tend to commemorate the achievements of communities and are important for constructing a collective memory, whereas those of non-Greeks

usually glorify individuals. This practice of creating a visual record can be seen as an attempt to write a historical narrative and influence the interpretation of the past by future generations.

While at first the narrative may seem to cast doubt on the strong relationship between autopsy and knowledge established in the metanarrative, I have argued that Herodotus' main purpose here is to highlight the interpretative problems of using *opsis* as a source. He wishes to show that to use *opsis* effectively the investigator requires intelligence (σύνεσις) and to be motivated by the right kind of desire – a thirst for knowledge and intellectual enrichment – rather than by any personal gain or glory.

This in turn contributes to one of the key purposes of the *Histories*: its didacticism. Herodotus wants to show his audience how to conduct a successful enquiry (*historie*) and harness *opsis* to obtain accurate information about the world, especially the past. The oral performance of the text would have provided a forum for the audience to participate in the enquiry and exercise their own investigative judgement.

Paramount in this context is the tripartite relationship between Herodotus as narrator, the characters in his narrative and the audience. Herodotus acts as a guide for the audience, navigating the successes and failures of his characters' experiences with *opsis* while demonstrating good practice in his own investigation, in order to demonstrate how to use *opsis* effectively.

Therefore the narrative and metanarrative do in fact work hand in hand to show the audience that autopsy is the best source for enquiry into the world, including past events, but that it has to be used with skill and intelligence.

7.3: *Opsis* in Context – Chapter 6

Herodotus' interest in the relative merits of different sources for learning about the world has been shown to be part of a broader fifth-century BC debate on the senses. The Hippocratics and some of the natural philosophers argued for empirical evidence as providing the most secure path to knowledge, partly as a reaction against the idea that deductions made through rational argument or 'hypotheses' could do so alone. There are several parallels with the *Histories*: the

privileging of *opsis* over other methods to reach the truth about the nature of things, the link between sight and knowledge, and using visible signs (such as a patient's symptoms) to discover more about invisible phenomena (diseases).

However, I have argued that Herodotus' innovation was the application of empirical methods to an enquiry into past events, which – as Schepens has recognised – Herodotus was the first to do (as far as we can tell from extant texts). While the Hippocratics looked at visible symptoms to learn about invisible diseases, Herodotus used the visible remains of the past to understand the invisible past events to which they related. This is underlined by the fact that the majority of autopsy references in the text refer to historical data and at 2.99, *opsis* is the only source named as relevant to both parts of the Egyptian investigation. Viewing visible remains also triggers enquiry into the events which brought them about.

The enquiry into the origins of Heracles at 2.44 is a passage crucial to demonstrating the development of Herodotus' methodology in this regard: his dissatisfaction with *akoe* and *gnome* as sources and his thirst for more accurate knowledge about the past are the motivations for his journey to Tyre to find visual evidence.

Here we can also see another key relationship in the *Histories*, that between the people of the past who set up physical visual memorials to commemorate their deeds with a view to communicating those deeds to future generations, and the people of the present, such as Herodotus and his audience, who use such memorials as visual evidence to interpret past events. The visual object becomes a channel of communication between the two, weaving narrative and metanarrative together.

7.4: New Ways of Seeing the Past

Herodotus developed an investigative method for historical enquiry based on *opsis* and a new language of autopsy to refer to visual evidence of the past. The triggers for this innovation were probably threefold: the temporal, geographical and ethnographical scale of the *Histories* was unprecedented, thus calling for a new investigative methodology; the experience of encountering the physical remains of

the past through travel prompted the realisation that they could provide a path to learning about the past events to which they related; and Herodotus' dissatisfaction with the limits of other methods for obtaining knowledge about historical events (especially *akoe*, the traditional source for historical material) prompted him to seek a new approach.

As was shown in Chapter 6, scholars have been reluctant to appreciate the importance of *opsis* to Herodotus as an investigator and its crucial role in his enquiry into the past. This may at least in part be a result of the division of knowledge in the late eighteenth and nineteenth century into separate disciplines such as history, ethnography and geography, which can make the breadth of Herodotus' *historie* and his digressions into all branches of human enquiry – even myth and fantasy – seem chaotic and unstructured to the modern mind. The prevalence of the Thucydidean model of history-writing, focusing on events contemporary with the historian, well into the twentieth century has also played a role here.

In many ways, Herodotus' critical fate parallels that of the antiquarians, collectors and 'virtuosos' of the early modern period, whose similarly eclectic interests and collecting habits were often received with puzzlement and even ridicule by both contemporaries and later scholars. For example, the modern categorisation of knowledge into separate disciplines has made Sir Hans Sloane's idea of natural history as encompassing medicine, natural phenomena, ethnographical material and wonders seem disordered, a fact that has hampered a full appreciation of his contribution to advancing human knowledge.[2] In this sense, Herodotus' pre-disciplinary form of *historie* may have acted as a barrier to recognising the significance of his use of material evidence for historical enquiry to the development of historiography.

As Momigliano has pointed out, 'Herodotus has really become the father of history only in modern times'.[3] The multi-disciplinary (as we would view it) approach to history-writing in the *Histories* is what makes Herodotus modern, particularly to ancient historians who use epigraphy and archaeological evidence as well as texts

[2] Delbourgo (2017) xxiv-xxv.

[3] Momigliano (1966) 141.

to interpret the ancient world. In my view, the application of *opsis* to historical enquiry was Herodotus' major contribution both to fifth-century BC *historie* and to the development of Western historiography as a whole.

Bibliography

Adam, C. and Roy, J. eds (2007), *Travel, Geography and Culture in Ancient Greece, Egypt and the Near East* (Oxford)

Alcock, S., Cherry, J. and Elsner, J. eds (2001), *Pausanias: Travel and Memory in Roman Greece* (Oxford)

Almagor, E. and Skinner, J. eds (2013), *Ancient Ethnography: New Approaches* (London)

Alonso-Núñez, J. M. (2002), *The Idea of Universal History in Greece: From Herodotus to the Age of Augustus* (Amsterdam)

Andrewes, A. (1977), *The Greek Tyrants* (London)

Armayor, O. K. (1978a), 'Did Herodotus Ever Go to the Black Sea?', *HSCPh* 82, 45-62

_____ (1978b), 'Did Herodotus ever go to Egypt?', *JARCE* 15, 59-73

_____ (1978c), 'Herodotus' Catalogues of the Persian Empire in the Light of the Monuments and the Greek Literary Tradition', *TAPhA* 108, 1-9

_____ (1980), 'Sesostris and Herodotus' Autopsy of Thrace, Colchis, Inland Asia Minor, and the Levant', *HSCPh* 84, 51-74

_____ (1985), *Herodotus' Autopsy of the Fayoum: Lake Moeris and the Labyrinth of Egypt* (Amsterdam)

Arrington, N. T. (2015), *Ashes, Images and Memories: The Presence of the War Dead in Fifth-Century Athens* (Oxford)

Asheri, D. (1978), *Erodoto. La Sconfitta dei Persiani: Libro IX delle Storie* (Fondazione Lorenzo Valla)

_____ (2006), *Erodoto. La Storie, Libro IX: La Battaglia di Platea* (Fondazione Lorenzo Valla)

_____ (2007), 'Commentary on Books I and III', in Murray and Moreno (2007)

Bakewell, G. W. and Sickinger, J. P. eds (2003), *Gestures: Essays in Ancient History, Literature and Philosophy Presented to Alan L. Boegehold* (Oxford)

Bakker, E. J. (2002), 'The Making of History: Herodotus' *Histories Apodexis*', in Bakker et al. (2002), 3-32

Bakker, E. J., de Jong, I., and Van Wees, H. eds (2002), *Brill's Companion to Herodotus* (Leiden)

de Bakker, M. (2012), 'Herodotus' Proteus: Myth, History, Enquiry and Storytelling', in Baragwanath and de Bakker (2012), 107-26

_____ (2016), 'An Uneasy Smile: Herodotus on Maps and the Question of How to View the World', in Barker et al. (2016), 81-99

Baragwanath, E. (2008), *Motivation and Narrative in Herodotus* (Oxford)

_____ (2012), 'The Mythic Plupast in Herodotus', in Grethlein and Krebs (2012), 35-56

Baragwanath, E. and de Bakker, M. eds (2012), *Myth, Truth and Narrative in Herodotus* (Oxford)

Barker, E. (2009), *Entering the Agon: Dissent and Authority in Homer, Historiography and Tragedy*, (Oxford)

Barker, E., Bouzarovski, S., Pelling, C. and Isaksen, L. eds (2016), *New Worlds from Old Texts: Revisiting Ancient Space and Place* (Oxford)

Barker, E. and Pelling, C. (2016), 'Space-travelling in Herodotus Book 5', in Barker et al. (2016), 225-52

Barnes, J. (1982), *The Presocratic Philosophers* (London)

Barnes, J., Brunschwig, J., Burnyeat, M. and Schofield, M. eds (1982), *Science and Speculation: Hellenistic Theory and Practice* (Cambridge)

Bartoš, H. (2015), *Philosophy and Dietetics in the Hippocratic On Regimen: A Delicate Balance of Health*, Studies in Ancient Medicine 44 (Leiden)

Bernadete, S. (1969), *Herodotean Inquiries* (The Hague)

Bertelli, L. (2001), 'Hecataeus: From Genealogy to Historiography', in Luraghi (2001a), 67-94

Blackman, D. R. and Sawyer, J. (2000), 'Croesus' *Craters* at Delphi', *OJA* 19(3), 319-21

Blok, J. H. and Lardinois, A. P. M. H., eds (2006), *Solon of Athens: New Historical and Philological Approaches* (Leiden)

Boardman, J. (1999), *The Greeks Overseas: Their Early Colonies and Trade* (4th edn., London)

Bolton, J. D. P. (1962), *Aristeas of Proconnesus* (Oxford)

Boedeker, D. (1987), 'The Two Faces of Demaratus', in Boedeker and Peradotto (1987), 185-201

_____ (1988), 'Protesilaus at the End of Herodotus' "Histories"', *CA* 7(1), 30-48

_____ (1993), 'Hero Cult and Politics in Herodotus: The Bones of Orestes", in Dougherty and Kurke (1993), 164-77

_____ (1998), 'Presenting the Past in Fifth-Century Athens', in Boedeker and Raaflaub (1998), 185-202

_____ (2001), 'Heroic Historiography: Simonides and Herodotus on Plataea', in Boedeker and Sider (2001), 120-34

_____ (2003), 'Pedestrian Fatalities: The Poetics of Death in Herodotus', in Derow and Parker (2003), 17-36

_____ (2012), 'Past and Plupast in Elegy, Lyric and Herodotus', in Grethlein and Krebs (2012), 17-34

Boedeker, D. and Peradotto, J. eds (1987), *Herodotus and the Invention of History*, *Arethusa* XX (1 and 2)

Boedeker, D. and Raaflaub, K. (1998), *Democracy, Empire and the Arts in Fifth-Century Athens* (Cambridge, M.A.)

_____ (2005), 'Tragedy and the City', in Bushnell (2005), 109-27

Boedeker, D. and Sider, D. eds (2001), *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire* (Oxford)

Börm, H. ed. (2015), *Antimonarchic Discourse in Antiquity* (Stuttgart)

Bowden, H. (1992), 'Review: Detlev Fehling. Herodotus and his "Sources": Citation, Invention and Narrative Art', *JHS* 112, 182-4

_____ (1996), 'The Greek Settlement and Sanctuaries at Naucratis: Herodotus and Archaeology', in Hansen and Raaflaub (1996), 17-37

_____ (2003), 'Oracles for Sale', in Derow and Parker (2003), 256-74

_____ (2005a), *Classical Athens and the Delphic Oracle: Divination and Democracy* (Cambridge)

_____ (2005b), 'Herakles, Herodotus and the Persian Wars', in Bowden and Rawlings (2005), 1-14

_____ (2010), *Mystery Cults in the Ancient World* (London)

_____ (2015), 'Impiety', in Eidinow and Kindt (2015), 325-38

Bowden, H. and Rawlings, L. eds (2005), *Herakles and Hercules: Exploring a Graeco Roman Divinity* (Swansea)

Bowie, A. (1993), *Aristophanes: Myth, Ritual and Comedy* (Cambridge)

_____ (1997), 'Tragic Filters for History: Euripedes' *Supplices* and Sophocles' *Philoctetes*', in Pelling (1997b), 39-62

_____ (2007), *Herodotus Histories: Book VIII* (Cambridge)

_____ (2009), 'Athens and Delphi in Aeschylus' *Oresteia*', in Goldhill and Hall (2009), 208-231

_____ (2012), 'Mythology and the Expedition of Xerxes', in Baragwanath and de Bakker (2012), 269-86

Bowie. E. L. (2001), 'Ancestors of Historiography in Early Greek Elegiac and Iambic Poetry', in Luraghi (2001a), 44-66

_____ (2009), 'Wandering Poets, Archaic Style', in Hunter and Rutherford (2009), 105-36

Bowra, C. M. (1961), *Greek Lyric Poetry from Alcmon to Simonides* (Oxford)

Branscome, D. (2013), *Textual Rivals: Self-Presentation in Herodotus' Histories* (Michigan)

_____ (2015), 'Waiting for Solon: Audience Expectations in Herodotus', *Histos* 9, 231-76

Braudel, F. (2001), *The Mediterranean in the Ancient World* (London)

Braun, T. (2004), 'Spines of Winged Snakes', in Karageorghis and Taifacos (2004), 265-86

Bridges, E., Hall, E. and Rhodes, P. J. eds (2007), *Cultural Responses to the Persian Wars: Antiquity to the Third Millennium* (Oxford)

Brennan, T. and Jay, M. eds (1996), *Vision in Context: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on Sight* (New York and London)

Brown, T. S. (1978), 'Aristodicus of Cyme and the Branchidae', *AJP* 99(1) 64-78

_____ (1988a), 'The Greek Exiles: Herodotus' Contemporaries', *Ancient World*, 17(1), 17-28

_____ (1988b), 'Herodotus' Travels', *Ancient World* 17(3) 67-75

Burian, P. (2009), 'Inconclusive Conclusion: The Ending(s) of *Oedipus Tyrannus*', in Goldhill and Hall (2009), 99-118

Burkert, W. (1995), 'Lydia Between East and West or How to Date the Trojan War: A Study in Herodotus', in Carter and Morris (1995)

_____ (2004), *Babylon, Memphis, Persepolis: Eastern Contexts of Greek Culture* (Cambridge, Mass.)

_____ (2005), 'Signs, Commands and Knowledge: Ancient Divination between Enigma and Epiphany', in Johnston and Struck (2005), 29-49

Bushnell, R. ed. (2005), *A Companion to Tragedy* (Malden)

Buxton, R. ed. (1999), *From Myth to Reason? Studies in the Development of Greek Thought* (Oxford)

Calame, C. (*trans.* Lloyd, J.), (1999), *The Poetics of Eros in Ancient Greece* (Princeton)

Cannadine, D. (1987), 'British History: Past, Present and Future?', *Past and Present* 116(1), 169-91

Carter, J. B. and Morris, S. P. eds (1995), *The Ages of Homer: A Tribute to Emily Townsend Vermeule* (Austin)

Cartledge, P. (2007), *Thermopylae: The Battle that Changed the World* (New York)

_____ (2009), 'Taking Herodotus Personally', *CW* 102(4), 371-382

_____ (2013), *After Thermopylae: The Oath of Plataea and the End of the Graeco-Persian Wars* (New York and Oxford)

Cartledge, P. and Greenwood E. (2002), 'Herodotus as a Critic: Truth, Fiction, Polarity', in Bakker et al. (2002), 351-71

Casson, L. (1994), *Travel in the Ancient World* (Baltimore)

Chamoux, F. (1953), *Cyrène sous la Monarchie des Battiades* (Paris)

Chiasson, C. C. (1986), 'The Herodotean Solon', *GRBS* 27, 247-62

_____ (2005), 'Myth, Ritual and Authorial Control in Herodotus' Story of Cleobis and Biton (Hist. 1.31)', *AJP* 126(1), 41-64

_____ (2012), 'Myth and Truth in Herodotus' Cyrus *Logos*', in Baragwanath and de Bakker (2012), 213-32

Chang, H. (2005), 'The Cities of the Hippocratic Doctors', in van der Eijk (2005a), 157-71

Christ, M. R. (1994), 'Herodotean Kings and Historical Enquiry', *CA* 13(2), 167-202

Christopoulos, M., Karakantza, E. D. and Levaniouk, O. eds (2010), *Light and Darkness in Ancient Greek Myth and Religion* (Plymouth)

Clark, M. (2012), *Exploring Greek Myth* (Malden)

Clarke, K. (2008), *Making Time for the Past: Local History and the Polis* (Oxford)

_____ (2018), *Shaping the Geography of Empire: Man and Nature in Herodotus'* Histories (Oxford)

Clarke, M.J., Currie, B. G. F. and Lyne, R. O. A. M., eds (2006), *Epic Interactions: Perspectives On Homer, Virgil and the Epic Tradition Presented to Jasper Griffin by Former Pupils* (Oxford)

Cohen, R. (2013), *Bernard Berenson: A Life in the Picture Trade* (New Haven and London)

Connor, W. R. (1987), 'Tribes, Festivals and Processions: Civic Ceremonial and Political Manipulation in Archaic Greece', *JHS* 107, 40-50

_____ (1993), 'The *Histor* in History', in Rosen and Farrell (1993), 3-15

Constantakopoulou, C. (2007), *Dance of the Islands: Insularity, Networks, the Athenian Empire, and the Aegean World* (Oxford)

Constantine, D. (2011), *In the Footsteps of the Gods: Travellers to Greece and the Quest for the Hellenic Ideal* (London)

Corcella, A. (1984), *Erodoto e l'analogia* (Palermo)

_____ (2007), 'Commentary on Book IV', in Murray and Moreno (2007)

_____ (2013), 'Herodotus and Analogy', in Munson (2013), 44-77

Craik, E. (2005), 'The Hippocratic Treatise *Peri Opsios* (*De Videndi Acie*, On the Organ of Sight)', in van der Eijk (2005a), 191-207

Curd, P. and Graham, D. W. eds (2008), *The Oxford Handbook of Presocratic Philosophy* (Oxford)

Davis, M. (2000), 'The Tragedy of Law: Gyges and Herodotus in Plato', *The Review of Metaphysics* 53(3), 635-655

_____ (2011), *The Soul of the Greeks: An Inquiry* (Chicago)

Dawson, W. R. (1986), 'Herodotus as a Medical Writer', *BCIS* 33, 87-96

Delbourgo, J. (2017), *Collecting the World: The Life and Curiosity of Hans Sloane* (London)

Demont, P. (2009), 'Figures of Inquiry in Herodotus's "Inquiries"', *Mnemosyne* 62(2), 179-205

Derow, P. (1995), 'Herodotus Readings', *Classics Ireland* 2, 29-51

Derow, P. and Parker, R. eds (2003), *Herodotus and his World* (Oxford)

Devereux, G. (1976), *Dreams in Greek Tragedy: An Ethno-Psycho-Analytical Study* (Oxford)

Dewald, C. (1981), 'Women and Culture in Herodotus' *Histories*', *Women's Studies* 8 (1-2), 93-126

_____ (1985), 'Practical Knowledge and the Historian's Role in Herodotus and Thucydides', in Jameson (1985), 47-63

_____ (1987), 'Narrative Surface and Authorial Voice in Herodotus' *Histories*', in Boedeker and Peradotto (1987), 147-70

_____ (1993), 'Reading the World: The Interpretation of Objects in Herodotus' *Histories*', in Rosen and Farrell (1993), 55-70

_____ (1997), 'Wanton Kings, Pickled Heroes, and Gnomic Founding Fathers: Strategies of Meaning at the End of Herodotus' *Histories*', in Roberts et al. (1997), 62-82

_____ (2002), ‘‘I Didn’t Give my Own Genealogy’: Herodotus and the Authorial Persona’, in Bakker et al. (2002), 267-289

_____ (2003), ‘Form and Content: The Question of Tyranny in Herodotus’, in Morgan (2003), 25-58

Dewald, C. and Marincola, J. eds (2006), *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus* (Cambridge)

Dignas, B. and Smith, R. R. R. eds (2012), *Historical and Religious Memory in the Ancient World* (Oxford)

Dillery, J. (2005), ‘Chresmologues and *Manteis*: Independent Diviners and the Problem of Authority, in Johnston and Struck (2005), 167-231

_____ (2018), ‘Making *Logoi*: Herodotus’ Book 2 and Hecataeus of Miletus’, in Harrison and Irwin (2018), 17-52

Dillon, M. (1997), *Pilgrims and Pilgrimage in Ancient Greece* (London)

Dodds, E. R. (1951), *The Greeks and the Irrational* (Berkeley)

Dougherty, C. (2001), *The Raft of Odyssesus: The Ethnographic Imagination of Homer’s Odyssey* (Oxford)

Dougherty, C. and Kurke, L. eds (1993), *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece* (Cambridge)

Drexler, H. (1972), *Herodot-Studien* (Hildesheim)

Dunn, F. (2005) ‘*On Ancient Medicine* and its Intellectual Context’, in van der Eijk (2005a), 49-67

Dunsch, B. and Ruffing, K. eds (2013), *Herodots Quellen – Die Quellen Herodots* (Wiesbaden)

Eidinow, E. and Kindt, J. eds (2015), *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Greek Religion* (Oxford)

van der Eijk, P. J. ed. (2005a), *Hippocrates in Context: Papers Read at the XIth International Hippocrates Colloquium University of Newcastle Upon Tyne 27-31 August 2002* (Leiden)

_____ (2005b), *Medicine and Philosophy in Classical Antiquity: Doctors and Philosophers on Nature, Soul, Health and Disease* (Cambridge)

_____ (2008), 'The Role of Medicine in the Formation of Early Greek Thought', in Curd and Graham (2008), 387-412

Ellis, A. (2016), 'A Socratic History: Theology in Xenophon's Rewriting of Herodotus' Croesus *Logos'*, *JHS* 136, 73-91

Elsner, Jas (2007), *Roman Eyes: Visuality & Subjectivity in Art & Text* (Princeton)

Elsner, John (1994), 'From the Pyramids to Pausanias and Piglet: Monuments, Travel and Writing', in Goldhill and Osborne (1994), 224-54

Elsner, J. and Rutherford, I. (2005a), 'Introduction', in Elsner and Rutherford (2005b), 1-40

_____ (2005b), *Pilgrimage in Graeco-Roman and Early Christian Antiquity: Seeing the Gods* (Oxford)

Evans, J. A. S. (1963), 'Herodotus and the Problem of the "Lake of Moeris"', *The Classical World* 56(9), 275-77

_____ (1987), Review of Armayor (1985), *American Historical Review* 93(3), 638-9

_____ (1991), *Herodotus, Explorer of the Past: Three Essays* (Princeton)

Everson, S (1990), *Epistemology* (Cambridge)

Fearn, D. ed. (2011), *Aegina: Contexts for Choral Lyric Poetry: Myth, History and Identity in the Fifth Century BC* (Oxford)

Fehling, D. (1989), *Herodotus and his 'Sources': Citation, Invention and Narrative Art* (Leeds)

_____ (1994), 'The Art of Herodotus and the Margins of the World', in von Martels (1994), 1-15

Fisher, N. and van Wees, H. eds (1998), *Archaic Greece* (London)

Fitzpatrick, A. and Edelman, D. eds (2015), *Assessing Biblical and Classical Sources for the Reconstruction of Persian Influence, History and Culture* (Wiesbaden)

Flannery-Dailey, F. (2004), *Dreamers, Scribes and Priests: Jewish Dreams in the Hellenistic and Roman Eras* (Leiden)

Flower, H. I. (1991), 'Herodotus and Delphic Traditions about Croesus', in Flower and Toher (1991), 57-77

Flower, M. A. (2008), *The Seer in Ancient Greece* (Berkeley)

Flower, M. A. and Marincola, J. eds (2002), *Herodotus Histories: Book IX* (Cambridge)

Flower, M. A. and Toher, M. eds (1991), *Georgica: Greek Studies in Honor of George Cawkwell BICS*, Supplement 58 (London)

Fornara, C. (1971), *Herodotus: An Interpretative Essay* (Oxford)

_____ (1983), *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Berkeley)

Fowler, R. (1996), 'Herodotus and his Contemporaries', *JHS*, 116, 62-87

_____ (2001), 'Early *Historie* and Literacy', in Luraghi (2001a), 95-115

_____ (2003), 'Herodotus and Athens', in Derow and Parker (2003), 305-18

_____ (2006), 'Herodotus and his Prose Predecessors', in Dewald and Marincola (2006), 29-45

Foxhall, L., Gehrke, H-J. and Luraghi, N. eds (2010), *Intentional History: Spinning Time in Ancient Greece* (Stuttgart)

Foxhall, L. and Luraghi, N. (2010), 'Introduction', in Foxhall, Gehrke and Luraghi (2010), 9-14

Friedman, R. (2006), 'Location and Dislocation in Herodotus', in Dewald and Marincola (2006), 165-77

Frisch, P. (1968), *Die Träume bei Herodot* (Meisenheim am Glan)

von Fritz, K. (1936), 'Herodotus and the Growth of Greek Historiography', *TAPA* 67, 315-40

Funke, P. (2004), 'Herodotus and the Major Sanctuaries of the Greek World', in Karageorghis and Taifacos (2004), 159-67

Gabriella, M., Bertinelli, A., and Donati, A. (2006), 'Le Vie della Storia. Migrazioni di Popoli, viaggi di individui, circolazione di idee vel Mediterraneo antico', *Serta Antiqua et Mediaevalia* IX (Rome)

Gabrielsen, V. and Lund, J. eds (2007), 'The Black Sea in Antiquity: Regional and Interregional Economic Exchanges', *Black Sea Studies* 6 (Aarhus)

Gehrke, H.-J. (2001), 'Myth, History and Collective Identity: Uses of the Past in Ancient Greece and Beyond', in Luraghi (2001a), 286-313

_____ (2010), 'Greek Representations of the Past', in Foxhall, Gehrke and Luraghi (2010), 15-34

Giangiulio, M. (2001), 'Constructing the Past: Colonial Traditions and the Writing of History. The Case of Cyrene', in Luraghi (2001a), 116-37

Gilhuly, K. and Worman, N. eds (2014), *Space, Place, and Landscape in Ancient Greek Literature and Culture* (Cambridge)

Goldhill, S. (1996), 'Refracting Classical Vision: Changing Cultures of Viewing', in Brennan and Jay (1996), 17-28

_____ (1999) 'Programme Notes' in Goldhill and Osborne (1999), 1-29

_____ (2007), 'What is *Ekphrasis* for?', *CPh* 102(1), 1-19

Goldhill, S. and Hall, E. eds (2009), *Sophocles and the Greek Tragic Tradition* (Cambridge)

Goldhill, S. and Osborne, R. eds (1994), *Art and Text in Ancient Greek Culture* (Cambridge)

_____ eds (1999), *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy* (Cambridge)

Göttlicher, A. (2004), 'Sailing with Herodotus. Some Remarks on 2.44', in Karageorghis and Taifacos (2004), 113-20

Gould, J. (1989), *Herodotus* (London)

Graf, F. (2015), 'Healing', in Eidinow and Kindt (2015), 503-18

Gray, V. (1996), 'Herodotus and Images of Tyranny: The Tyrants of Corinth', *AJPh* 117(3) 361-89

_____ (1997), 'Reading the Rise of Pisistratus: Herodotus 1.56-68', *Histos* 1, 128-53

_____ (2001), 'Herodotus' Literary and Historical Method: Arion's Story (1.23-24), *AJPh* 112(1), 11-28

_____ (2002), 'Short Stories in Herodotus' Histories', in Bakker et al. (2002), 291-317

Grethlein, J. (2009), 'How Not to Do History: Xerxes in Herodotus' "Histories"', *AJPh* 130(2), 195-218

_____ (2010), *The Greeks and their Past: Poetry, Oratory and History in the Fifth Century BCE* (Cambridge)

_____ (2013), *Experience and Teleology in Ancient Historiography: 'Futures Past' from Herodotus to Augustine* (Cambridge)

Grethlein, J. and Krebs, C. B. eds (2012), *Time and Narrative in Ancient Historiography: The 'Plupast' from Herodotus to Appian* (Cambridge)

Grethlein, J. and Rengakos, A. eds (2010), *Narratology and Interpretation: The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature* (Berlin and New York)

Griffin, J. (2006), 'Herodotus and Tragedy', in Dewald and Marincola (2006), 46-59

Griffiths, A. (1999), 'Euenius the Negligent Nightwatchman' (Herodotus 9. 92-6), in Buxton (1999), 169-82

_____ (2001), 'Kissing Cousins: Some Curious Cases of Adjacent Material in Herodotus', in Luraghi (2001a), 161-78

Grmek, M. D. ed. (1980), *Hippocratica: Actes du Colloque Hippocratique de Paris, 4-9 Septembre 1978* (Paris)

Grottanelli, C. (1999), 'On the Mantic Meaning of Incestuous Dreams', in Shulman and Stroumsa (eds) (1999), 143-168

Hägg, R. ed. (1999), *Ancient Greek Hero Cult, Proceedings of the Fifth International Seminar on Ancient Greek Hero Cult, organised by the Department of Classical Archaeology and Ancient History, Göteborg University, 21-23 April 1995* (Stockholm)

Hall, E. (1989), *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy* (Oxford)

_____ (2006), *The Theatrical Cast of Athens: Interactions between Ancient Greek Drama and Society* (Oxford)

_____ (2007), 'Tragedy Personified', in Kraus et al. (2007), 221-256

_____ (2010), *Greek Tragedy: Suffering under the Sun* (Oxford)

Hansen, M. H. and Rauflaub, K. eds (1996), *More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis* (Stuttgart)

Harris, E. M. (2006), 'Solon and the Spirit of the Laws in Archaic and Classical Greece', in Blok and Lardinois (2006), 290-318

Harris, W. (2009), *Dreams and Experience in Classical Antiquity* (Cambridge, Mass.)

Harris-McCoy, D. (2012), *Artemidorus' Oneirocritica: Text, Translation and Commentary* (Oxford)

Harrison, T. (1998a), 'Herodotus' Conception of Foreign Languages', *Histos* 2, 1-45

_____ (1998b), 'Herodotus and "The English Patient"', *Classics Ireland* 5, 48-63

_____ (2000a), *Divinity and History: The Religion of Herodotus* (Oxford)

_____ (2000b), *The Emptiness of Asia: Aeschylus' Persians and the History of the Fifth Century* (London)

_____ (2002), 'The Persian Invasions', in Bakker et al. (2002), 551-78

_____ (2003a), '"Prophecy in Reverse"? Herodotus and the Origins of History', in Derow and Parker (2003), 237-55

_____ (2003b), 'The Cause of Things: Envy and the Emotions in Herodotus' *Histories*', in Konstan and Rutter (2003), 143-63

_____ (2007a), 'Greek Religion and Literature', in Ogden (2007), 373-84

_____ (2007b), 'The Place of Geography in Herodotus' *Histories*', in Adams and Roy (2007), 44-65

_____ (2015a), 'Herodotus on the Character of Persian Imperialism (7.5-11)', in Fitzpatrick and Edelmann (2015), 9-48

_____ (2015b), 'Belief vs. Practice', in Eidinow and Kindt (2015), 21-8

Harrison, T. and Irwin, E. eds (2018), *Interpreting Herodotus* (Oxford)

Hartmann, A. (2013), '*Cui vetustas fidem faciat*: Inscriptions and Other Material Relics of the Past in Graeco-Roman Antiquity', in Liddel and Low (2013a), 33-63

Hartog, F. (1988), *The Mirror of Herodotus: The Representation of the Other in the Writing of History* (Berkeley)

_____ (2001), *Memories of Odysseus: Frontier Tales from Ancient Greece* (Edinburgh)

Harvey, D. (2004), 'Herodotus Mythistoricus: Arion and the Liar?', in Karageorghis and Taifacos (2004), 287-306

Hedrick, C. W. (1993), 'The Meaning of Material Culture: Herodotus, Thucydides and their Sources', in Rosen and Farrell (1993), 17-37

Hesk, J. (2000), *Deception and Democracy in Classical Athens* (Cambridge)

Higbie, C. (1997), 'The Bones of a Hero, The Ashes of a Politician: Athens, Salamis and the Usable Past', *CA* 16(2), 278-307

Hollmann, A. (2011), *The Master of Signs: Signs and the Interpretation of Signs in Herodotus' Histories* (Cambridge, Mass.)

Holmes, B. (2010), *The Symptom and the Subject: The Emergence of the Physical Body in Ancient Greece* (Princeton and Oxford)

_____ (2012), *Gender: Antiquity and its Legacy* (London and New York)

_____ (2015), 'Medicine and Misfortune: *Symptoma* in Greek Medical Writing', in Holmes and Fischer (2015), 191-209

Holmes, B. and Fischer, K.-D. eds (2015), *The Frontiers of Ancient Science: Essays in Honor of Heinrich von Staden* (Berlin)

Holowchak, M. A. (2002), *Ancient Science and Dreams: Oneirology in Greco-Roman Antiquity* (Maryland)

Hornblower, S. (1994), *Greek Historiography* (Oxford)

_____ (2001), 'Epic and Epiphanes: Herodotus and the "New Simonides"', in Boedeker and Sider (2001), 135-47

_____ (2002), 'Herodotus and his Sources', in Bakker et al. (2002), 373-86

_____ (2003), 'Panionios of Chios and Hermotimos of Pedasa (Hdt. 8.104-6)', in Derow and Parker (2003), 37-57

_____ (2008), *A Commentary on Thucydides: Volume III* (Oxford)

_____ (2011), *The Greek World, 479-323 BC* (4th edn., London)

_____ ed. (2013), *Herodotus Histories: Book V* (Cambridge)

Hornblower, S. and Pelling, C. eds (2017), *Herodotus Histories: Book VI* (Cambridge)

How, W. W. and Wells, J. (1912), *A Commentary on Herodotus with Introduction and Appendixes*, Vol. I and II (Oxford)

Hunter, R. and Rutherford, I. eds (2009), *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture: Travel, Locality and Pan-Hellenism* (Cambridge)

Hussey, E. (1990), 'The Beginnings of Epistemology: from Homer to Philolaus', in Everson (1990), 11-38

Huxley, G. (1979), 'Bones for Orestes', *GRBS* 20(2), 145-8

Immerwahr, H. R. (1957), 'The Samian Stories of Herodotus', *CJ* 52(7), 312-22

_____ (1966), '*Ergon*: History as a Monument in Herodotus and Thucydides', *AJPh* 81(3), 261-90

_____ (1986), *Form and Thought in Herodotus* (Atlanta)

Irwin, E. (2005), *Solon and Early Greek Poetry: The Politics of Exhortation* (Cambridge)

_____ (2009), 'Herodotus and Samos: Personal or Political?', *CW* 102(4), 395-416

_____ (2011a), 'Herodotus on Aeginetan Identiy', in Fearn (2011), 373-425

_____ (2011b), '"Lest the things done by men become *exitela*": Writing up Aegina in a Late Fifth-Century Context', in Fearn (2011), 426-57

_____ (2014), 'Ethnography and Empire: Homer and the Hippocratics in Herodotus' Ethiopian *Logos* 3.17-26', *Histos* 8, 25-75

Irwin, E. and Greenwood, E. eds (2007), *Reading Herodotus: A Study of the* Logoi *in Book 5 of Herodotus' Histories* (Cambridge)

Isaac, B. (2004), *The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity* (Princeton)

Jameson, M. H. ed. (1985), *The Greek Historians: Literature and History; Papers Presented to A. E. Raubitschek* (Saratoga, Calif.)

_____ (1999), 'The Spectacular and the Obscure in Athenian Religion', in Goldhill and Osborne (1999), 321-40

Johnston, S. I. and Struck, P. T. eds, (2005), *Mantikê: Studies in Ancient Divination* (Leiden)

de Jong, I. J. F. (2012a), 'The Helen *Logos* and Herodotus' Fingerprint', in Baragwanath and de Bakker (2012), 127-42

_____ ed. (2012b), *Space in Ancient Greek Literature: Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative,* Volume Three (Leiden)

de Jong, I. J. F. and Nünlist, R. eds (2007), *Time in Ancient Greek Literature: Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative*, Volume Two (Leiden)

Jouanna, J. (1999), *Hippocrates* (Baltimore)

_____ (2003), *Hippocrate Oeuvres Complètes Vol. 5* (Paris)

_____ (2005), 'Cause and Crisis in Historians and Medical Writers of the Classical Period', in van der Eijk (2005a), 3-27

Jouanna, J. (2012), ed. van der Ejik, P., *Greek Medicine from Hippocrates to Galen: Selected Papers* (Leiden)

Kaplan, P. (2006), 'Dedications to Greek Sanctuaries by Foreign Kings in the Eighth through to The Sixth Centuries BCE', *Historia* 55(2) 129-152

Karageorghis, V. (2004), 'Herodotus and Cyprus', in Karageorghis and Taifacos (2004), 1-7

Karageorghis, V. and Taifacos, I., eds (2004) *The World of Herodotus: Proceedings of an International Conference held at the Foundation Anastasios G. Leventis, Nicosia, September 18-21, 2008* (Nicosia), 265-85

Kavoulaki, A. (1999), 'Processional Performance and the Democratic Polis' in Goldhill and Osborne (1999), 293-320

Kearns, E. (1990), 'Saving the City', in Murray and Price (1990), 323-344

Ker, J. (2000), 'Solon's *Theoria* and the End of the City', *CA* 19(2), 304-9

Kessels, A. H. M. (1978), *Studies on the Dream in Greek Literature* (Utrecht)

Keyser, P. (1986), 'Errors of Calculation in Herodotus', *CJ* 81(3), 230-42

Kim, H. J. (2013), 'The Invention of the "Barbarian" in Late Sixth-Century BC Ionia', in Almagor and Skinner (2013), 25-48

Kindstrand, J. F. (1981), *Anacharsis: The Legend and the Apophthegmata* (Stockholm)

Konstan, D. (1983), 'The Stories in Herodotus' *Histories*, book I', *Helios* 10(1), 1-22

_____ (1987), 'Persians, Greeks and Empire', in Boedeker and Peradotto (1987), 59-73

Konstan, D. and Rutter, N. K. eds (2003), *Envy, Spite and Jealousy: The Rivalrous Emotions in Ancient Greece* (Edinburgh)

Kosmetatou, E. (2013), 'Herodotus and Temple Inventories', in Liddel and Low (2013a), 65-77

Kraus. C., Goldhill, S., Foley, H. and Elsner, J. eds (2007), *Visualising the Tragic: Drama, Myth and Ritual in Greek Art and Literature. Essays in Honour of Froma Zeitlin* (Oxford)

Kurke, L. (1999), *Coins, Bodies, Games and Gold: The Politics of Meaning in Archaic Greece* (Princeton)

Kurz, G., Müller, D. and Nicolai, W. eds (1981), *Gnomosyne: Menschliches Denken und Handeln in der frühgriechischen Litteratur. Festschrift für Walter Marg zum 70. Geburtstag* (München)

Lang, M. L. (1984), *Herodotean Narrative and Discourse* (Cambridge, Mass.)

_____ (1992), 'Prexaspes and Usurper Smerdis', *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, 51(3), 201-207

Laskaris, J. (2002), *The Art is Long: On the Sacred Disease and the Scientific Tradition* (Leiden)

Lateiner, D. (1986), 'The Empirical Element in the Methods of the Early Greek Medical Writers and Herodotus: An Shared Epistemological Response', *Antichthon*, 20, 1-18

_____ (1987), 'Nonverbal Communication in the *Histories* of Herodotus', in Boedeker and Peradotto (1987), 83-119

_____ (1989), *The Historical Method of Herodotus* (Toronto)

_____ (1990a), 'Deceptions and Delusions in Herodotus', *CA* (9)2, 230-42

_____ (1990b), 'Review: Detlev Fehling. Herodotus and his "Sources": Citation, Invention and Narrative Art', *CW* 84(1), 75-6

Lavelle, B. M. (2005), *Fame, Money and Power: The Rise of Peisistratos and "Democratic" Tyranny at Athens* (Michigan)

Lesher, J. H. (2008), 'The Humanizing of Knowledge in Presocratic Thought', in Curd and Graham (2008), 458-84

Létoublon, F. (2010), 'To See or not to See: Blind People and Blindness in Ancient Greek Myth', in Christopoulos et al. (2010) 167-80

Liddel, P. and Low, P. eds (2013a), *Inscriptions and their Uses in Greek and Latin Literature* (Oxford)

_____ (2013b), 'Introduction: The Reception of Ancient Inscriptions', in Liddel and Low (2013a), 1-29

van Lieshout, R. G. A. (1970), "A Dream on a *Kairos* of History: An Analysis of Herodotus "Hist." VII 112-19; 47", *Mnemosyne* 23(3), 225-249

_____ (1980), *Greeks on Dreams* (Utrecht)

Lightfoot, J. (2003), *Lucian: On the Syrian Goddess* (Oxford)

Lissarrague, F. (2007), 'Looking at Shield Devices: Tragedy and Vase Painting', in Kraus et al. (2007), 151-164

Litotsakis, V. and Farrington, S. eds (2016), *The Art of History: Literary Perspectives on Greek and Roman Historiography* (Berlin)

Lloyd, A. B. (1975), *Herodotus Book II: Introduction* (Leiden)

_____ (1976), *Herodotus Book II: Commentary 1-98* (Leiden)

_____ (1988), *Herodotus Book II: Commentary 99-182* (Leiden)

_____ (1995), 'Herodotus on Egyptian buildings: a test case', in Powell, A. (1995)

_____ (2002), 'Egypt', in Bakker et al. (2002), 415-35

_____ (2004), 'Herodotus on Egypt and Ethiopia', in Karageorghis and Taifacos (2004), 43-52

_____ (2007), 'Commentary on Book II', in Murray and Moreno (2007)

Lloyd, G. E. R. (1979), *Magic, Reason and Experience: Studies in the Origin and Development of Greek Science* (Cambridge)

_____ (1987), *The Revolutions of Wisdom: Studies in the Claims and Practices of Ancient Greek Science* (Berkeley and Los Angeles)

_____ (1991), *Methods and Problems in Greek Science* (Cambridge)

_____ (2003), *In the Grip of Disease: Studies in the Greek Imagination* (Oxford)

_____ (2012), *Being, Humanity and Understanding: Studies in Ancient and Modern Societies* (Oxford)

_____ (2014), *The Ideas of Inquiry: An Ancient History* (Oxford)

_____ (2015), *Analogical Investigations: Historical and Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Human Reasoning* (Cambridge)

Long, A. A. (1999), *The Cambridge Companion to Early Greek Philosophy* (Cambridge)

Lovatt, H. (2013), *The Epic Gaze: Vision, Gender and Narrative in Ancient Epic* (Cambridge)

Lovatt, H. and Vout, C. eds (2013), *Epic Visions: Visuality in Greek and Latin Epic and its Reception* (Cambridge)

Low, P. (2012), 'The Monuments to the War Dead in Classical Athens: Form, Contexts, Meanings', in Low et al. (2012), 13-39

Low, P., Oliver, G. and Rhodes, P. J. eds (2012), *Cultures of Commemoration: War Memorials, Ancient and Modern* (Oxford)

Luraghi, N. (2001a), *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus* (Oxford)

_____ (2001b), 'Local Knowledge in Herodotus' Histories', in Luraghi (2001a), 138-60

_____ (2006) 'Meta-historie: Method and Genre in the Histories', in Dewald and Marincola (2006), 76-91

_____ (2009), 'The Importance of Being λόγιος' *CW* 104(2), 439-56

_____ ed. (2013a), *The Splendors and Miseries of Ruling Alone: Encounters with Monarchy from Ancient Greece to the Hellenistic Mediterranean* (Stuttgart)

_____ (2013b), 'To Die Like a Tyrant', in Luraghi (2013a), 49-72

_____ (2014), 'The Cunning Tyrant: The Cultural Logic of a Narrative Pattern', in Moreno and Thomas (2014), 67-92

_____ (2015), 'Anatomy of the Monster: The Discourse of Tyranny in Ancient Greece', in Börm (2015), 67-84

MacGinnis, J. (1986), 'Herodotus' Description of Babylon', *BICS* 33, 67-86

Mackie, C.J. ed. (2004), *Oral Performance and its Context: Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece, Vol. 5* (Leiden)

Malkin, I. (1998), *The Returns of Odysseus: Colonization and Ethnicity* (Berkeley)

_____ (2003), '"Tradition" in Herodotus: The Foundation of Cyrene', in Derow and Parker (2003), 153-70

Maniura, R. and Shepherd, R. eds (2006), *Presence: The Inherence of the Prototype within Images and Other Objects* (Aldershot)

Mann, J. E. (2012), *Hippocrates: On the Art of Medicine* (Leiden)

Mansfeld, J. (1980), 'Theoretical and Empirical Attitudes in Early Greek Scientific Medicine', in Grmek (1980), 371-91

Mari, M. (2013), 'From Inscriptions to Literature (and Sometimes Back Again): Some Uses of the Epigraphic Sources in the Ancient Literary Traditions at Delphi', in Liddel and Low (2013a), 125-47

Marincola, J. (1987), 'Herodotean Narrative and the Narrator's Presence' in Boedeker and Peradotto (1987), 121-37

_____ (1997), *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography* (Cambridge)

_____ (2006), 'Herodotus and the Poetry of the Past', in Dewald and Marincola (2006), 13-28

_____ ed. (2007), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography* (Oxford)

von Martels, Z. (ed), *Travel Fact and Fiction: Studies on Fiction, Literary Tradition, Scholarly Discovery and Observation in Travel Writing* (Leiden)

Martin, R. P. (1996), 'The Scythian Accent: Anacharsis and the Cynics', in Branham, R. B. ed., *The Cynics: The Cynic Movement in Antiquity and Its Legacy* (Berkeley)

Matthews, R. (2006), *The Battle of Thermopylae: A Campaign in Context* (Stroud)

Maurizio, L. (1998), 'The Panathenaic Procession: Athens' Participatory Democracy on Display?', in Boedeker and Raaflaub (1998), 297-317

McCauley, B. (1999), 'Heroes and Power: The Politics of Bone Transferral", in Hägg (1999), 87-98

McQueen, E. I. (2000), *Herodotus Book VI* (Bristol)

Mehl, A. (2004), 'Herodotus and Xanthus of Sardis Compared', in Karageorghis and Taifacos (2004), 337-50

Meier, C. (1987), 'Historical Answers to Historical Questions: The Origins of History in Ancient Greece', in Boedeker and Peradotto (1987), 41-57

Meiggs, R. and Lewis, D. eds (1988), *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century BC* (Oxford)

Messer, W. S. (1918), *The Dream in Homer and Greek Tragedy* (New York)

Mikalson, J. (2002), 'Religion in Herodotus', in Bakker et al. (2002), 187-198

Mitchell, L. G. (1997), 'New Wine in Old Wineskins: Solon, *arete* and the *agathos*', in Mitchell and Rhodes (1997), 137-147

_____ (2013), *The Heroic Rulers of Archaic and Classical Greece* (London)

Mitchell, L.G. and Rhodes, P. J. eds (1997), *The Development of the Polis in Archaic Greece* (London)

Moles, J. (2002), 'Herodotus and Athens', in Bakker et al. (2002), 33-52

_____ (2007), '"Saving" Greece from the "Ignominy" of Tyranny? The "Famous" and "Wonderful" Speech of Socles (5.92)', in Irwin and Greenwood (2007), 245-68

Momigliano, A. (1966), *Studies in Ancient Historiography* (New York)

_____ (1990), *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography* (Berkeley)

Montiglio, S. (2005), *Wandering in Ancient Greek Culture* (Chicago)

Moreno, A. and Thomas, R. eds (2014), *Patterns of the Past: Epitedeumata in the Greek Tradition* (Oxford)

Morgan, K. A. ed. (2003), *Popular Tyranny: Sovereignty and its Discontents in Ancient Greece* (Austin)

Morrison, J. V. (2004), 'Memory, Time and Writing: Oral and Literary Aspects of Thucydides' *History*', in Mackie (2004), 95-116

Müller, D. (1981), 'Herodot – Vater des Empirismus? Mensch und Erkenntnis im Denken Herodots', in Kurz et al (1981), 299-318

_____ (2004), 'Herodotus' Topography of Battlefields', in Karageorghis and Taifacos (2004), 259-54

Munson, R. (2001), *Telling Wonders: Ethnographic and Political Discourse in the Work of Herodotus* (Michigan)

_____ (2009), 'Who are Herodotus' Persians?', *CW* 104(2), 457-70

_____ (2012), 'Herodotus and the Heroic Age: The Case of Minos", in Baragwanath and de Bakker (2012), 195-214

_____ ed. (2013), *Herodotus: Volume 2: Herodotus and the World* (Oxford)

Murray, O. (1993), *Early Greece* (London)

_____ (2001), 'Herodotus and Oral History' and 'Herodotus and Oral History Reconsidered', in Luraghi, N. (2001a), 16-44 and 314-25

Murray, O. and Moreno, A., eds (2007), *A Commentary on Herodotus Books I-IV* (Oxford)

Murray, O. and Price, S. eds (1990), *The Greek City from Homer to Alexander* (Oxford)

Näf, B. (2004), *Traum und Traumdeutung im Altertum* (Darmstadt)

Naiden, F. S. (1999), 'The Prospective Imperfect in Herodotus', *HSCP* 99, 135-49

Noussia-Fantuzzi, M. (2010), *Solon the Athenian, the Poetic Fragments* (Leiden)

Nutton, V. (2004), *Ancient Medicine* (London and New York)

Ogden, D. ed. (2007), *A Companion to Greek Religion* (Malden, MA)

Oppenheim, A. L. (1956), "The Interpretation of Dreams in the Ancient Near East", *TAPhA* 46(3), 179-373

Osborne, R. (1997), 'The Ecstasy and the Tragedy: Varieties of Religious Experience in Art, Drama, and Society', in Pelling (1997b), 187-212

Ostwald, M. (1991), 'Herodotus and Athens', *Illinois Classical Studies* 16(1/2), 137-148

Packman, Z. (1991), 'The Incredible and the Incredulous: The Vocabulary of Disbelief in Herodotus, Thucydides and Xenophon', *Hermes* 119, 399-414

Papazarkadas, N. ed (2014a), *The Epigraphy and History of Boeotia: New Finds, New Prospects* (Leiden)

_____ (2014b), 'Two New Epigrams from Thebes', in Papazarkadas (2014a), 223-51

Parke, H. W. (1939), *A History of the Delphic Oracle* (Oxford)

_____ (1984), 'Croesus and Delphi', *GBRS* 25(3), 209-32

Parker, R. (1996), *Athenian Religion: A History* (Oxford)

_____ (1997), 'Gods Cruel and Kind: Tragic and Civic Theology', in Pelling (1997b), 143-60

_____ (2005), *Polytheism and Society at Athens* (Oxford)

_____ (2011), *On Greek Religion* (New York)

Parry, A. ed. (1971), *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry* (Oxford)

Patton, K. (2004), '"A Great and Strange Correction": Intentionality, Locality, and Epiphany in the Category of Dream Incubation', *History of Religions* 43(3), 194-223

Pelling, C. (1991), 'Thucydides' Archidamus and Herodotus' Artabanus', in Flower and Toher (1991), 120-42

_____ (1996), 'The Urine and the Vine: Astyages' Dreams at Herodotus 1.107-8', *CQ* 46(i), 68-77

_____ (1997a), 'East is East and West is West – or Are They? National Stereotypes in Herodotus', *Histos* 1, 50-66

_____ ed. (1997b), *Greek Tragedy and the Historian* (Oxford)

_____ (1997c), 'Aeschylus' *Persae* and History', in Pelling (1997b), 1-19

_____ (2006a), 'Educating Croesus: Talking and Learning in Herodotus' Lydian *Logos*', *CA* 25(1), 141-77

_____ (2006b), 'Homer and Herodotus', in Clarke et al. (2006) 75-104

_____ (2006c), 'Speech and Narrative in the *Histories'*, in Dewald and Marincola (2006), 103-21

_____ (2007), '*De Malignitate Plutarchi*: Plutarch, Herodotus and the Persian Wars', in Bridges, Hall and Rhodes (2007), 145-64

_____ (2009), 'Bringing Autochthony Up-to-Date: Herodotus and Thucydides', *CW* 104(2), 471-83

_____ (2011), 'Herodotus and Samos', *BICS* 54(1), 1-18

_____ (2016), 'Herodotus, Polycrates – and maybe Stesimbrotus too?', *JHS* 136, 113-20

Pendrick, G. J. ed. (2002), *Antiphon the Sophist: The Fragments* (Cambridge)

Petridou, G. and Thumiger, C. eds (2016), *Homo Patiens – Approaches to the Patient in the Ancient World*, Studies in Ancient Medicine 45 (Leiden)

Petsalis-Diomedis, A. (2006) 'Amphiaraos Present: Images and Healing Pilgrimage in Classical Greece', in Maniura and Shepherd (2006), 205-29

_____ (2007), 'Landscape, Transformation and Divine Epiphany', in Swain, Harrison and Elsner (2007), 250-89

_____ (2010), *'Truly Beyond Wonders': Aelius Aristides and the Cult of Asklepios* (Oxford)

Phillips, D. D. (2003), 'The Bones of Orestes and Spartan Foreign Policy', in Bakewell and Sickinger (2003), 301-16

van der Plas, D. (1987), *Effigies Dei: Essays on the History of Religions* (Brill)

Platt, V. (2011), *Facing the Gods: Epiphany and Representation in Graeco-Roman Art, Literature and Religion* (Cambridge)

_____ (2015), 'Epiphany', in Eidinow and Kindt (2015), 491-504

de Polignac, F. (1995), *Cults, Territory and the Origin of the Greek City-State* (Chicago and London)

Powell, A. ed. (1995), *The Greek World* (London)

Powell, J. E. (1938), *A Lexicon to Herodotus* (Cambridge)

Pratt, L. (1994), 'Odyssey 19.535-50: On the Interpretation of Dreams and Signs in Homer', *CPh* 89(2), 147-152

Pretzler, M. (2007), *Pausanias: Travel Writing in Ancient Greece* (London)

Price, S. (2012), 'Memory and Ancient Greece', in Dignas and Smith (2012), 15-36

Pritchett, W. K. (1979), *The Greek State at War: Part 3, Religion* (Berkeley)

_____ (1993), *The Liar School of Herodotus* (Amsterdam)

Purves, A. C. (2010), *Space and Time in Ancient Greek Narrative* (Cambridge)

_____ (2014), 'In the Bedroom: Interior Space in Herodotus' *Histories*', in Gilhuly and Worman (2014), 94-129

Raaflaub, K. A. (1987), 'Herodotus, Political Thought and the Meaning of History', in Boedeker and Peradotto (1987), 221-48

_____ (2002), 'Philosophy, Science and Politics: Herodotus and the Intellectual Trends of his Time', in Bakker et al. (2002), 149-86

_____ (2010), 'Ulterior Motives in Ancient Historiography: What Exactly, and Why?', in Foxhall, Gehrke and Luraghi (2010), 189-210

Ratté, C. (1994), 'Not the Tomb of Gyges', *JHS* 114, 157-61

Raubitschek, A. E. (1955), 'Gyges in Herodotus', *Classical Weekly* 48(4), 48-50

Redfield, J. (1985), 'Herodotus the Tourist', *CP* 80(2) 97-118

Rhodes, P. J. (1993), 2nd ed., *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia* (Oxford)

_____ (2003), 'Herodotean Chronology Revisited', in Derow and Parker (2003), 58-72

Roberts, D. M., Dunn, F. M. and Fowler, D. eds (1997), *Classical Closure: Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature* (Princeton)

Romm, J.S. (1992), *The Edges of the Earth in Ancient Thought* (Princeton)

_____ (1998), *Herodotus* (New Haven)

Rood, T. (2007), 'Herodotus', in de Jong and Nünlist (2007), 115-30

_____ (2012), 'Herodotus', in de Jong and Nünlist (2007), 121-40

Rosen, R. M. and Farrell, J. eds (1993), *Nomodeiktes: Greek Studies in Honor of Martin Ostwald* (Michigan)

Rösler, W. (2002), 'The Histories and Writing', in Bakker et al. (2002), 79-94

Rutherford, I. (2001), 'Tourism and the Sacred: Pausanias and the Traditions of Greek Pilgrimage', in Alcock et al. (2001), 40-52

_____ (2005), 'Down-Stream to the Cat-Goddess: Herodotus on Egyptian Pilgrimage', in Elsner and Rutherford (2005b) 131-49

_____ (2013), *State Pilgrims and Sacred Observers in Ancient Greece: A Study of Theoria and Theoroi* (Cambridge)

Saïd, E. W. (1978), *Orientalism* (London)

Saïd, S. (2002), 'Herodotus and Tragedy', in Bakker et al. (2002), 117-148

Salmon, J. B. (1984), *Wealthy Corinth: A History of the City to 338 BC* (Oxford)

Sanders, E. ed. (2013), *Eros and the Polis: Love in Context*, BICS (Supp. 119)

Sanders, E., Thumiger, C., Carey, C. and Lowe, N. eds (2013), *Eros in Ancient Greece* (Oxford)

Sassi, M. M. (2001), *The Science of Man in Ancient Greece* (Chicago)

Sauer, E. W. ed. (2004), *Archaeology and Ancient History: Breaking Down the Boundaries* (London and New York)

Schepens, G. (1975), 'Some Aspects of Source Theory in Greek Historiography', *Ancient Society* 6, 257-274

_____ (1980), *L'Autopsie dans la Méthode des Historiens Grecs du Ve Siècle Avant J.C.* (Belgium)

_____ (2006), 'Travelling Greek Historians', in Gabriella et al. (2006), 81-102

_____ (2007), 'History and *Historia*: Inquiry in the Greek Historians', in Marincola (2007), 39-55

Schiefsky, M. (2005a), *Hippocrates On Ancient Medicine* (Leiden)

_____ (2005b), 'On Ancient Medicine on the Nature of Human Beings', in van der Eijk (2005a), 69-85

Scott, L. (2005), *Historical Commentary on Herodotus Book 6* (Leiden)

Scullion, S. (2006), 'Herodotus and Greek Religion', in Dewald and Marincola (2006), 192-208

Sedgwick, W. B. (1957), 'The Use of the Imperfect in Herodotus', *CQ* 7(3/4), 113-17

Sedley, D. (1982), 'On Signs', in Barnes et al. (1982), 239-72

Sergueenkova, V. (2016), 'Counting the Past in Herodotus' *Histories'*, *JHS* 136, 121-31

Shapiro, H. A. (1998), 'Autochthony and the Visual Arts in Fifth-Century Athens', in Boedeker and Raaflaub (1998), 127-51

Shapiro, S. (1996), 'Herodotus and Solon', *Classical Antiquity* 15(2), 348-64

_____ (2000), 'Proverbial Wisdom in Herodotus', *TAPA* 130, 89-118

Shear, J, (2013), '"Their Memories will Never Grow Old": The Politics of Remembrance in the Athenian Funeral Orations', *CQ* 63(2), 511-536

Shrimpton, G. S. (1997), *History and Memory in Ancient Greece* (Montreal and Kingston)

Shulman, D. and Stroumsa, G. (eds) (1999), *Dream Cultures: Explorations in the Comparative History of Dreaming* (Oxford)

Sinos, R. (1993), 'Divine Selection: Epiphany and Politics in Archaic Greece', in Dougherty and Kurke (1993), 73-91

Skinner, J. (2013), *The Invention of Greek Ethnography: From Homer to Herodotus* (Oxford)

Smith, D. N. (1987), *Herodotus and the Archaeology of Asia Minor: A Historiographic Study* (University of California, Berkeley, *diss.*)

Squire, M. (2010), 'Making Myron's Cow Moo?: Ecphrastic Epigram and the Poetics of Simulation', *AJPh* 131(4), 589-634

_____ (2013), 'Ekphrasis at the Forge and the Forging of Ekphrasis: the 'Shield of Achilles' in Graeco-Roman Word and Image', *Word and Image* 29(2), 157-91

Stehle, E. (2006), 'Solon's Self-Reflexive Political Personna and its Audience', in Blok and Lardinois (2006), 79-113

Steinbock, B. (2013), *Social Memory in Athenian Public Discourse: Uses and Meanings of the Past* (Michigan)

Steiner, D. (1994), *The Tyrant's Writ: Myths and Images of Writing in Ancient Greece* (Princeton)

_____ (2001), *Images in Mind: Statues in Archaic and Classical Greek Literature and Thought* (Princeton and Oxford)

Stern, J. (1991), 'Scapegoat Narratives in Herodotus', *Hermes* 119(3), 304-11

Stewart, C. (2012), *Dreaming and Historical Consciousness in Island Greece* (Cambridge, Mass.)

Swain, S., Harrison, S. and Elsner, J. eds (2007), *Severan Culture* (Cambridge)

Tatti-Gartziou, A. (2010), 'Blindness as Punishment', in Christopoulos et al. (2010), 181-92

Thomas, R. (1989), *Oral Tradition and the Written Record in Classical Athens* (Cambridge)

_____ (1992), *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge)

_____ (1997), 'Ethnography, Proof and Argument in Herodotus' Histories', *PCPhS* 43, 128-148

_____ (2000) *Herodotus In Context: Ethnography, Science and the Art of Persuasion* (Cambridge)

_____ (2001), 'Herodotus' *Histories* and the Floating Gap', in Luraghi (2001), 198-210

_____ (2004), 'Herodotus, Ionia and the Athenian Empire', in Karageorghis and Taifacos (2004), 27-42

_____ (2006), 'The Intellectual Milieu of Herodotus', in Dewald and Marincola (2006), 60-75

Thonemann, P. (2016), 'Croesus and the Oracles', *JHS* 136, 152-67

Thumiger, C. (2013), 'Mad *Eros* and Eroticized Madness in Tragedy', in Sanders et al. (2013), 27-40

_____ (2016), 'Patient Function and Physician Function in the Hippocratic Cases', in Petridou and Thumiger (2016), 107-37

Vansina, J. (1965), *Oral Tradition: A Study in Historical Methodology* (London)

van der Veen, J. E. (1996), *The Significant and the Insignificant: Five Studies in Herodotus' View of History* (Amsterdam)

Vegetti, M. (1999), 'Culpability Responsibility, Cause: Philosophy, Historiography, and Medicine in the Fifth Century', in Long (1999), 271-89

Versnel. H. S. (1987), 'What did Ancient Man see when he saw a God? Some Reflections on Graeco-Roman Epiphany', in Van der Plas (1987), 42-55

_____ (2011), *Coping with the Gods: Wayward Readings in Greek Theology* (Leiden)

Vlassopoulos, K. (2013a), *Greeks and Barbarians* (Cambridge)

_____ (2013b), 'The Stories of the Others: Storytelling and Intercultural Communication in the Herodotean Mediterranean', in Almagor and Skinner (2013), 49-75

Walde, C. (1999), 'Dream Interpretation in a Prosperous Age? Artemidorus, the Greek Interpreter of Dreams', in Shulman and Stroumsa (eds) (1999), 121-142

Wallace, R. W. (2016), 'Redating Croesus: Herodotean Chronologies, and the Dates of the Earliest Coinages', *JHS* 136, 168-81

Warren, J. (2007), *Presocratics* (Stocksfield)

Waterfield, R. (2009), 'On "Fussy Authorial Nudges" in Herodotus', *CW* 104(2), 485-94

Webb, R. (2009), *Ekphrasis, Imagination and Persuasion in Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Practice* (Surrey)

van Wees, H. (2002), 'Herodotus and the Past', in Bakker et al. (2002), 321-49

Wells, J. (1923), 'Herodotus and the Intellectual Life of his Age', in *Studies in Herodotus* (Oxford), 184-205

Welser, C. (2009), 'Two Didactic Strategies at the End of Herodotus' *Histories* (9.108-122)', *CA* 28(2), 359-85

West, S. (1985), 'Herodotus' Epigraphical Interests', *CQ* 35(2), 278-305

_____ (1987), 'And it Came to Pass that Pharaoh Dreamed: Notes on Herodotus 2.139, 141, *CQ* 37(ii), 262-71

_____ (1991), 'Herodotus' Portrait of Hecataeus', *JHS* 111, 144-60

_____ (1992), 'Sesostris' Stelae', *Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, 117-20

_____ (2003), '"The Most Marvellous of All Seas"; The Greek Encounter with the Euxine', *Greece & Rome* 50(2), 151-167

_____ (2004), 'Herodotus and Scythia', in Karageorghis and Taifacos (2004), 73-90

_____ (2013), '"Every Picture Tells a Story": A Note on Herodotus 4.88', in Dunsch and Ruffing (2013), 117-28

Wilson, N. G. (2015), *Herodotea: Studies on the Text of Herodotus* (Oxford)

Wood, C. (2016), '"I am going to say... ": A Sign on the Road of Herodotus' *Logos*', *CQ* 66.1, 13-31

Zaccarini, M. (2015), 'The Return of Theseus to Athens: A Case Study in Layered Tradition and Reception', *Histos* 5, 174-98

Zeitlin, F. (1994), 'The Artful Eye: Vision, Ecphrasis and Spectacle in Euripidean Theatre', in Goldhill and Osborne (1994), 138-96

Appendix A

Autopsy References (131 / 146)

Direct Eyewitness (47)

Citation	Description	Greek
1.51.3	Croesus' bowl at Delphi appears to H. to be extraordinary	φαίνεταί μοι
1.93.3	Construction of tomb of Alyattes: it appeared when the numbers on the plaques were added up that prostitutes did the most work	ἐφαίνετο μετρεόμενον
1.193.4	Anyone who has not been to Babylon will not believe the size of the millet	τοῖσι μὴ ἀπιγμένοισι ... ἀπῖκται
2.5.1	It seems to H. that the priests of Hephaestus are right when they say the land was once under water, as anyone can see that the land has been gained from the river	εὖ μοι ἐδόκεον ... δῆλα γὰρ δὴ καὶ μὴ προακούσαντι, ἰδόντι δέ
2.8.3	Description of Egypt south of Heliopolis; distances as they appeared to H.	στάδιοι ... ἐδόκεόν μοι εἶναι
2.10.1	Land appeared to have been gained from the sea including land south of Memphis	ἐδόκεε καὶ αὐτῷ μοι εἶναι ... ἐφαίνετό μοι εἶναι
2.12.1	H. has seen Egypt projects into the sea, shells appear in mountains, salt on ground	ἰδών ... κογχύλιά τε φαινόμενα
2.29.1	H. travelled and used autopsy as far as Elephantine	αὐτόπτης ἐλθών
2.44.2	H. travelled to Tyre where he saw the temple of Heracles	εἶδον
2.44.3	H. saw the temple of Thasan Heracles in Tyre	εἶδον
2.75.1	H. saw skeletons of winged-snakes near Buto	εἶδον
2.99.1	H. has used *opsis*, *gnome* and *historie* so far in his Egyptian account; from now on he will be using *logoi* supplemented by *opsis*	ὄψις τε ἐμὴ; τῆς ἐμῆς ὄψιος
2.103.1	Sesostris' pillars can be seen as far as Scythia and Thrace but nowhere further on	μοι δοκέει ... φαίνονται
2.104.1	The Colchians appear to be Egyptians	φαίνονται
2.106.1	Most of Sesostris' pillars no longer exist but H. has seen them in Palestinian Syria	οὐκέτι φαίνονται ... αὐτὸς ὥρων
2.106.2-5	Carved figure in Ionia is of Sesostris, not of Memnon as some people who have	τῶν θεησαμένων

Citation	Description	Greek
	seen it think	
2.125.6	Notice on pyramid is read out to H. by his interpreter and H. tries to remember it	ὡς ἐμὲ εὖ μεμνῆσθαι τὰ ὁ ἑρμηνεύς μοι ἐπιλεγόμενος τὰ γράμματα ἔφη
2.127.2	H. has measured Cheops' and Chephren's pyramids and describes their positions	ταῦτα γὰρ ὧν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐμετρήσαμεν
2.130.1	Wooden cow still apparent in H.'s day in palace at Sais	φανερή
2.131.3	H. saw statues of Mycerinus' concubines and their hands were still apparent, lying on the floor	ταῦτα γὰρ ὧν καὶ ἡμεῖς ὡρῶμεν ... ἐφαίνοντο
2.132.1	Only the neck and head of the wooden cow is revealed	φαίνει
2.135.3	It is still possible to see in Delphi to what a tenth of Rhodopis' fortune amounted	ἰδέσθαι ἔστὶ ἔτι καὶ
2.136.1	All the gates of the temple of Hephaestus have many 'sights of construction' (in the sense of marvels)	ἔχει ... ἄλλην ὄψιν οἰκοδομημάτων μυρίην
2.137.5; 2.138.2	Temple of Bubastis at Bubastis: no other temple 'more pleasant to be seen'; as the city has been raised but the temple remains in its original position, it is possible to look down on and into it from all around	ἡδονὴ δὲ ἰδέσθαι οὐδὲν τούτου μᾶλλον; κατορᾶται πάντοθεν ... ἔσοπτόν ἑστι
2.143.1-3	H. is shown statues of priests in the temple of Zeus in Thebes	ἐποίησαν ... οἷόν τι καὶ ἐμοὶ ... δεικνύντες κολοσσοὺς ... δεικνύντες ... ἐμοὶ
2.147.1	H. will now include accounts of other people, supplemented by what he has seen	τῆς ἐμῆς ὄψιος
2.148.1, 5-6	H. saw the labyrinth near lake Moeris; he saw the ground-level rooms so can speak about them as he has seen them; again says he saw ground-level rooms	ἐγὼ ἤδη εἶδον λόγου μέζω ... αὐτοί τε ὡρῶμεν διεξιόντες καὶ αὐτοὶ θεησάμενοι λέγομεν ... αὐτοὶ ὡρῶμεν
2.155.3-156.1	H. saw temple made of single block of stone within the precinct of Leto at Buto	τὸ δέ μοι τῶν φανερῶν ἦν θῶμα μέγιστον ... τῶν φανερῶν μοι ...
2.156.1	... the second most wonderful thing H. saw was the island of Chemmis	... τῶν δὲ δευτέρων νῆσος
2.159.1	Slipways constructed by Necho still visible	τῶν ἔτι οἱ ὁλκοί εἰσι δῆλοι
2.170.2	Size of the pond in Sais is the same as that of the pond in Delos in H.'s view	ἑστι ... ὡς ἐμοὶ ἑδόκεε

Citation	Description	Greek
2.175.3	Among Amasis' *erga* H. admires most the chamber hewn from a single block of stone from Elephantine and brought to Sais	ἀλλὰ μάλιστα θωμάζω, ἐστὶ τόδε
3.5.2	Cadytis in Palestinian Syria seemed to H. not much smaller than Sardis	ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκέει
3.12.1, 3-4	H. sees skulls at Pelusium and Papremis; fewer bald men seen in Egypt than elsewhere	εἶδον ἴδοιτο εἶδον; εἶδον
3.37.2-3	Statue in the temple of Hephaestus closely resembles the Phoenician Pataici: H. explains what they look like for anyone who has not seen them. The statues of the Cabiri are very similar	ὃς δὲ τούτους μὴ ὅπωπε, ἐγὼ δὲ σημανέω ... ἔστι ... ὅμοῖα
3.47.3	Linen breastplate which Amasis was sending to Egypt but was stolen by the Samians is worthy of wonder; all the threads are visible	θωμάσαι ἄξιον ... ποιέει; φανεράς
4.11.4	Grave of the Cimmerian royal family by the River Tyras can still be seen today	καί σφεων ἔτι δῆλός ἐστι ὁ τάφος
4.36.2	H. has looked at maps of the world and is amused to find that they have all been drawn wrong	γελῶ δὲ ὀρέων γῆς περιόδους
4.81.2	In Exampaeus H. is shown the Scythian bowl representing the population	τοσόνδε μέντοι ἀπέφαινόν μοι ές ὄψιν
4.81.4	H. compares the Scythian bowl with the bowl set up by Pausanias at the mouth of the Euxine Sea, but for anyone who has not seen this, H. will describe the Scythian bowl	ὃς δὲ μὴ εἶδέ κω τοῦτον, ὧδε δηλώσω
4.82	Footprint of Heracles which 'they point out' in a rock by the Tyras River	φαίνουσι
4.86.4	H. measures the Euxine Sea	οὕτω τέ μοι μεμετρέαται
4.195.2	H. saw pitch-gathering from a pool in Zacynthos	αὐτὸς ἐγὼ ὥρων
5.59	H. has seen Cadmean writing in Thebes	εἶδον δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς
6.47.1	H. saw mines in Thasos	εἶδον δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς τὰ μέταλλα ταῦτα
7.129.4	Rift in Thessaly seemed to H. to have been formed by an earthquake and anyone who saw it would think Poseidon was responsible	ἰδὼν ... ὡς ἐμοὶ φαίνεται εἶναι
9.85.3	Tombs of other nations that appear at Plataea are said to be empty	φαίνονται

Denial of Direct Eyewitness (5)

Citation	Description	Greek
1.183.3	H. did not see the gold statue of Bel in Babylon	ἐγὼ μέν μιν οὐκ εἶδον
2.73.1	H. has not seen phoenix, only a picture of one	ἐγὼ μέν μιν οὐκ εἶδον
2.150.2	H. could not see the excavated earth from Lake Moeris which troubled him	οὐκ ὥρων ... ἐπιμελὲς γὰρ δή μοι ἦν
2.156.2	H. did not see the island of Chemmis move	αὐτὸς μὲν ἔγωγε ... οὔτε ... εἶδον
3.6.1	Not possible to see a single empty wine jar in Egypt	οὐκ ἔστι ... ἰδέσθαι

Objects that are Still There or Customs etc that are Still Practised in Herodotus' Day (32)

ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ (18)

Objects (12)

Citation	Description	Greek
1.52	Gold shield and spear dedicated by Croesus to Amphiaraus in the temple of Ismenian Apollo, Thebes	τὰ ἀμφότερα ἐς ἐμὲ ἦν ἔτι καὶ κείμενα
1.66.4	Chains with which Spartans were bound after the war with Tegea are now hanging on the wall in the temple of Athena Alea in Tegea	ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἦσαν σόαι
1.92.1	Dedications made by Croesus: golden tripod in the temple of Ismenian Apollo, Thebes; golden cows and pillars in Ephesus; gold shield in the temple of Athena before the Temple, Delphi	καὶ ἔτι ἐς ἐμὲ ἦν περιεόντα
1.93.3	Five plaques at the top of the tomb of Alyattes with record of its builders' achievements inscribed	ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἦσαν
1.181.2	Sanctuary of Zeus as Bel in Babylon	καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἔτι τοῦτο ἐόν
2.130.1	Cow in which Mycerinus' daughter was buried lies in the royal palace at Sais	ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἦν φανερή, ἐν Σάρϊ μὲν πόλι ἐοῦσα, κειμένη
2.131.3	Hands of the wooden female statues in the palace at Sais lying on the ground at their feet	ἐφαίνοντο ἐοῦσαι ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμέ
2.181.5	Statue of Athena dedicated by Ladice in Cyrene, just outside the town	ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἦν σόον
4.124.1	Ruined remains of eight forts built by Darius on the banks of the River Oarus, Scythia	ἔτι ἐς ἐμὲ τὰ ἐρείπια σόα ἦν
5.77.3	Chains used by the Athenians to tie up Boeotian and Chalcidean prisoners hanging on walls on the Acropolis, opposite the west-facing temple	ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἦσαν περιεοῦσαι, κρεμάμεναι
8.39.2	Two rocks that fell from Mount Parnassus and frightened off the invading Persians preserved in the precinct of Athena Before the Temple, Delphi	ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἠμέας ἦσαν σόοι ... κείμενοι
8.121.1	Phoenician trireme dedicated at the Isthmus after the battle of Salamis	ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἦν

Customs / Practices / Traditions (6)

Citation	Description	Greek
2.30.3	Persian guard-posts still in place at Elephantine and Daphnae as had existed in the time of Psammetichus	ἔτι δὲ ἐπ᾽ ἐμεῦ καὶ ... ἔχουσι
3.97.4	Tribute of a hundred boys and a hundred girls paid by the Colchians to the Persians every five years	ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ διὰ πεντετηρίδος ἀγίνεον
4.204	Village of Barca in Bactria still inhabited by Barcaeans enslaved and transported from Egypt by Darius	ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἦν οἰκεομένη
5.45.2	Plots of land in Croton still inhabited by descendants of Callias of Elis	τὰ καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἔτι ἐνέμοντο
5.88.3	Argive and Aegineatan women still wear longer brooches	ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἐφόρεον
6.42.2	Artaphrenes' tribute assessment system still in force in Ionia	διατελέουσι ... ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ

(ἔτι καὶ) τὸ μέχρι ἐμεῦ (8)

Objects (2)

Citation	Description	Greek
2.154.5	Slipways for warships and ruined houses of first Ionians and Carians who came to Egypt	τὸ μέχρι ἐμεῦ ἦσαν
2.182.1	Two wooden statues dedicated by Amasis in the Heraion on Samos	ἱδρύατο ἔτι καὶ τὸ μέχρις ἐμεῦ

Customs / Practices / Traditions (6)

Citation	Description	Greek
2.113.2	Practice of giving refuge to house-slaves in the temple of Heracles at the Canopic mouth of the Nile	ἐὼν ὅμοῖος τὸ μέχρι ἐμεῦ
3.97.3	Ethiopian tribute to the Persians of gold, ebony wood, boys, and ivory	ἀγινέουσι δὲ καὶ τὸ μέχρις ἐμεῦ
5.115.1	Cult of Onesilus practised in Amathous, Cyprus	νυν ἐποίευν ταῦτα καὶ τὸ μέχρι ἐμεῦ
6.119.4	Eretrian community transported by Darius is still living in Ardericca, Cissia	καὶ μέχρι ἐμέο εἶχον
7.111.1	Satrae the only tribe in Thrace to have	διατελεῦσι τὸ μέχρι ἐμεῦ

Citation	Description	Greek
	retained their independence	
6.98.1 (Denial)	Earthquake on Delos has never happened again up to H.s' day	μέχρι ἐμεῦ

ἔτι (καὶ νῦν) (6)

Objects (3)

Citation	Description	Greek
2.135.4	Iron spits dedicated by Rhodopis at Delphi still lying behind the Chian altar	καὶ νῦν ἔτι συννενέαται
2.159.1	Slipways built by Necho from his triremes in the Arabian Gulf by the Red Sea	τῶν ἔτι οἱ ὀλκοί εἰσι δῆλοι
4.11.4	Tomb of the Cimmerian royal family by the River Tyras	καί σφεων ἔτι δῆλός ἐστὶ ὁ τάφος

Customs / Practices / Traditions (3)

Citation	Description	Greek
2.99.3	Persians still closely watch bend in the Nile to ensure the river does not burst its banks	ἔτι δὲ καὶ νῦν ... ἔχεται
3.48.3	Samian festival for unmarried boys and girls first instituted when they gave Corcyran boys asylum	καὶ νῦν ἔτι χρέωνται κατὰ ταύτά
7.178.2	Delphic practice of offering sacrifices to the winds at their altar in Thyia	ἔτι καὶ νῦν τοὺς ἀνέμους ἱλάσκονται

Describing the Current Location or Position of Physical Objects (47)

καὶ and/or νῦν κεῖται / ἵδρυται / ἐστι / εἰσὶ / ἕστηκε (16)

Citation	Description	Greek
1.50.3	Gold lion statue dedicated by Croesus now stands in the Corinthian treasury at Delphi	καὶ νῦν κεῖται
1.69.4	Spartan statue of Apollo now stands in Thornax, Laconia	τὸ νῦν ... ἵδρυται
2.112.1	Precinct of Proteus in Memphis, south of temple of Hephaestus	τοῦ νῦν τέμενος ἐστὶ
2.113.2	Sanctuary of Heracles at Canopic mouth of the Nile is still there now	καὶ νῦν ἐστι
2.141.6	Statue of Sethos stands in the sanctuary of Hephaestus	καὶ νῦν ... ἕστηκε
3.142.2	Altar to Zeus the Liberator built by Maeandrius on Samos, on the edge of the town, is still there	τὸ νῦν ... ἐστί
4.12.1-2	Even today there are in Scythia places called the Cimmerian Walls or Straits, there is a tract of land called Cimmeria and a part of the Bosphorus called Cimmerian. Cimmerians fled into Asia and settled in the peninsula where the Greek town of Sinope is now established	καὶ νῦν ἔστι ... ἔστι ... ἔστι ... ἔστι ... νῦν Σινώπη πόλις Ἑλλὰς οἴκηται
4.15.4	Statue of Aristeas in Metapontum still stands in the town square next to the statue of Apollo surrounded by laurel trees	καὶ νῦν ἕστηκε ... ἐστᾶσι ... ἵδρυται
4.166.2	Aryandic silver is still the purest silver	καὶ νῦν ἐστὶ
5.63.4	Tomb of Anchimolus situated in Alopecae, Attica, near the temple of Heracles at Cynosarges	καὶ ... εἰσὶ
5.67.1	Shrine to Adrastus was and still is in the main square in Sicyon	ἦν καὶ ἔστι
5.89.3	Precinct to Aeacus now stands in the agora in Athens	τὸ νῦν ... ἵδρυται
6.14.3	Column inscribed with the names of Samians who fought at the battle of Lade stands in the agora	καὶ ἕστι
7.225.2	Rise in the Thermopylae pass were the stone lion commemorating Leonidas now stands	νῦν ... ἕστηκε
7.228.1-4	Memorials set up to the dead at Thermopylae	ἐπιγέγραπται ... ἐπιγέγραπται ... νυν καὶ στήλησι ... εἰσὶ

Citation	Description	Greek
8.33	Oracle still at Abae	ἦν δὲ καὶ τότε καὶ νῦν ἔστι

κεῖται / ἵδρυται/ ἐστὶ/ εἰσὶ / ἕστηκε/ ἑστᾶσι/ other verbs in perfect tense (31)

Citation	Description	Greek
1.14.2-3	Six gold bowls dedicated by Gyges stand in the Corinthian treasury at Delphi; Throne dedicated by Midas stands in the same place	ἑστᾶσι κεῖται
1.24.8	Bronze statue of a man riding a dolphin dedicated by Arion in Taenarum	ἐστὶ
1.51.2-4	Croesus' dedications at Delphi: gold bowl in the Clazomenean treasury, silver bowl in the corner of the temple porch; four silver jars in the Corinthian treasury	κεῖται ἑστᾶσι
1.93.5	Lake of Gyges by the tomb of Alyattes	ἔχεται; ἐστὶ
1.98.3-6	Description of Deioces' palace in a place 'now called Ecbatana'	τὰ νῦν ... κέκληται; ἐστὶ / εἰσὶ (used six times)
1.178-200	Full description of Babylon, its location and key sights: present tenses throughout	κεῖται (twice); ἑνεστᾶσι; ἐστὶ / εἰσὶ (13 times)
2.91.2	Description of the sanctuary of Perseus at Chemmis	ἐστὶ ... ἐστὶ ... ἑστᾶσι ... ἑνέστηκε
2.99.4	City founded by Min which is 'now called' Memphis and lies in the narrow part of Egypt	νῦν ... καλέεται ἐστὶ ...
2.124.4-5	Description of Cheops' pyramid and the road leading to it	εἰσὶ ... ἐστὶ ... ἑστᾶσι ... ἐστὶ
2.130.2	Female wooden statues in the royal palace at Sais are standing in a room near to the wooden cow	ἑστᾶσι ... ἑστᾶσι
2.132.1	Precise description of size, position and decoration of the wooden cow in Sais	ἔπεστι ... ἐστὶ
2.153	Courtyard of Apis built by Psammetichus opposite the southern gateway of the sanctuary of Hephaestus, Memphis	ὑπεστᾶσι
2.169.4-170	Tomb of Apries in Sais next to temple in the sanctuary of Athena on left hand side; Amasis' tomb is within the courtyard of the sanctuary and its appearance is described by H.; Tomb of Osiris is also within the sanctuary, behind the temple;	εἰσὶ ἐστὶ ... ἐστὶ ... ἕστηκε ... ἐστὶ εἰσὶ

Citation	Description	Greek
	Stone obelisks within the precinct	ἑστᾶσι
2.176	Amasis' dedications in Egypt: large figure lying on its back outside the temple of Hephaestus, Memphis; Two smaller standing figures next to it; Similar figure in Sais; Sanctuary of Isis, Memphis	εἰσὶ ἑστᾶσι ἑστὶ ἑστὶ
3.47.3	Breastplate dedicated by Amasis to Athena in Lindos	ἑστὶ
3.57.2	Siphnian treasury at Delphi	ἀνάκειται
3.60	Great Samian *erga* including tunnel, a mole in the sea enclosing the harbour, and the Heraion	ἑστὶ ... εἰσὶ … ἑστὶ
4.33.3; 34.2; 35.4	Delos: Hyperborean men who escort sacred objects are 'now called' Perphereis; Tomb of Hyperoche and Laodice is inside the sanctuary of Artemis, on the left with an olive tree growing over it; Tomb of Opis and Arge is behind the sanctuary of Artemis, facing East, next to the banqueting-hall of the Ceans	οἳ νῦν ... καλέονται ἑστὶ ἑστὶ
4.162.3	Censer dedicated by Euelthon of Salamis stands in the Corinthian treasury, Delphi	κεῖται
5.77.4	Bronze four-horse chariot dedicated by Athenians after their victory over the Boeotians and Chalcideans stands on the left on entering the Propylaea on the Acropolis and is inscribed	ἔστηκε
6.74.2	Waters of the River Styx to be found in Nonacris, Arcadia, where water drips out of a rock into a basin encircled by a wall	καὶ δὴ καὶ ἑστὶ … φαινόμενον ... στάζει … περιθέει … ἑστὶ
7.30.2	Pillar set up by Croesus stands in Cydrara, on the border between Lydia and Phrygia	καταπεπηγυῖα ... καταμηνύει
7.59.2	Coastline near Cape Serreium, Thrace, has a Samothracian settlement called Sale and a town called Zone built there	Πεπόλισται
7.176.3	An altar of Heracles stands within the Thermopylae pass	ἵδρυται
8.27.5	Statues dedicated by the Phocians at Delphi stand around the tripod in front of the temple; Similar statues also at Abae	συνεστεῶτες ἀνακέαται
8.121.2	Statue with the beak of a ship in its hand dedicated by the Greeks in Delphi after the battle of Salamis stands in the same place as the statue of Alexander the Macedonian	ἔστηκε
8.122	Aeginetans dedicated three gold stars fixed to a bronze mast at Delphi which	ἑστᾶσι

Citation	Description	Greek
	stands very near Croesus' bowl	
9.52	Temple of Hera at Plataea stands in front of the town	ἐστὶ
9.57.2	Sanctuary of Demeter of Eleusis at Argiopius	ἧσται
9.81.1	Gold tripod dedicated at Delphi by Greeks after the battle of Plataea sits on the bronze three-headed serpent very close to the altar	ἐπεστεὼς
9.116.2	Tomb and precinct of Protesilaus in Elaeus on the Chersonese	ἐστὶ

Other Words and Phrases (15)

ἀξιοθέητος (12)

Citation	Description	Greek
1.14.3	Throne of Midas dedicated at Delphi	ἐόντα ἀξιοθέητον
1.25.2	Silver bowl on an iron stand dedicated by Alyattes at Delphi	θέης ἄξιον
1.184	Dykes on the plain at Babylon	ἐόντα ἀξιοθέητα
2.111.4	Two stone obelisks dedicated by Pheros in the sanctuary of the sun, Heliopolis	ἀξιοθέητα
2.163.1	Apries' palace in Sais	ἐόντα … ἀξιοθέητα
2.176.1	Dedications made by Amasis in Egypt	ἀξιοθέητα
2.176.2	Sanctuary of Isis, Memphis	ἐὸν ... ἀξιοθεητότατον
2.182.1	Linen breastplate dedicated by Amasis to Athena in Lindos	ἀξιοθέητον
3.123.1	Polycrates' furniture dedicated by Maeandrius in the Heraion, Samos	ἐόντα ἀξιοθέητον
4.85.1	Euxine Sea	ἐόντα ἀξιοθέητον
4.162.3	Censer dedicated by Euelthon in Delphi	ἐὸν ἀξιοθέητον
9.70.3	Bronze manger belonging to Mardonius dedicated by the Tegeans in the temple of Athena Alea	θέης ἀξίην

Other (3)

Citation	Description	Greek
1.70	Bronze bowl sent by the Spartans to Croesus ended up in the Heraion on Samos	ἀναθεῖναί μιν ές τὸ Ἥραιον
2.134.2	Mycerinus' pyramid which H. describes, has been attributed to Rhodopis by Greek writers. H. disagrees with them as 'the building of a pyramid such as this' could not be her work	ποιήσασθαι τοιαύτην
4.88	Picture with inscription of Darius and his army crossing the bridge over the Bosphorus and dedicated in the Heraion on Samos by Mandrocles, the bridge's engineer	ταῦτα γραψάμενος ἀνέθηκε ἔς τὸ Ἥραιον, ἐπιγράψας τάδε ...

Statements of Travel or Personal Contact with a Specific Source (21)

Citation	Description	Greek
1.20	H. hears direct confirmation from the Delphians	Δελφῶν οἶδα ἐγὼ οὕτω ἀκούσας γενέσθαι
2.2.5	H. speaks with the priests of Hephaestus in Memphis	τῶν ἱρέων τοῦ Ἡφαίστου τοῦ ἐν Μέμφι ἥκουον
2.3.1	H. speaks with the priests of Hephaestus in Memphis and then travels to Thebes and Heliopolis	ἐλθὼν ἐς λόγους τοῖσι ἱρεῦσι τοῦ Ἡφαίστου. καὶ δὴ καὶ ἐς Θήβας τε καὶ ἐς Ἡλίου πόλιν αὐτῶν τούτων εἵνεκεν ἐτραπόμην
2.13.1	More conversation between H. and the priests	ἔλεγον δὲ καὶ τόδε μοι ... οἱ ἱρέες; τῶν ἱρέων ταῦτα ἐγὼ ἤκουον
2.19.1, 3	Neither the priests nor anyone else he asked in Egypt could tell H. about the Nile's floods	οὔτε τι τῶν ἱρέων οὔτε ἄλλου οὐδενὸς παραλαβεῖν ἐδυνάσθην; οὐδενὸς οὐδὲν οἷός τε ἐγενόμην παραλαβεῖν {παρὰ} τῶν Αἰγυπτίων, ἱστορέων ...
2.28.1-2	H. speaks to the scribe in the temple of Athena at Sais whom he felt was teasing him	οὗτος δ' ἔμοιγε παίζειν ἐδόκεε, φάμενος εἰδέναι ἀτρεκέως
2.32.1	H. speaks to the Cyreneans	ἤκουσα ἀνδρῶν Κυρηναίων
2.44.4	H. travels to Thasos	ἀπικόμην δὲ καὶ ἐς Θάσον
2.52.1	H. gathering information in Dodona	ὡς ἐγὼ ἐν Δωδώνῃ οἶδα ἀκούσας
2.54.2-55.1	H. speaks to the priests of Theban Zeus	εἰρομένου δέ μευ; τῶν ἐν Θήβῃσι ἱρέων ἤκουον
2.75.1	H. travelled to the mountain pass between Egypt and Arabia near Buto to find out about the winged snakes	ἐς τοῦτο τὸ χωρίον ἦλθον
2.77.1	Egyptians south of the marshes of the northern Delta are the most learned H. had visited and questioned	λογιώτατοι εἰσὶ μακρῷ τῶν ἐγὼ ἐς διάπειραν ἀπικόμην
2.91.5	H. speaks to the people of Chemmis	εἰρομένου δέ μευ
2.104.1	H. speaks to the Colchians and the Egyptians	εἰρόμην ἀμφοτέρους
2.113.1	H. questions the priests of Hephaestus	ἔλεγον δέ μοι οἱ ἱρέες ἱστορέοντι
2.118.1	H. questions the priests of Hephaestus	εἰρομένου δέ μευ τοὺς ἱρέας

Citation	Description	Greek
3.55.2	H. meets Archias, grandson of Archias, in Pitana, Sparta	Ἀρχίῃ ... αὐτὸς ἐν Πιτάνῃ συνεγενόμην
4.14.1	H. hears a story about Aristeas on Proconnesus and in Cyzicus	ἤκουον λόγον ἐν Προκοννήσῳ καί Κυζίκῳ
4.76.6	H. speaks to Tymnes, steward of King Ariapithes, Scythia	ὡς δ᾽ ἐγὼ ἤκουσα Τύμνεω
4.95.1	H. speaks to Greeks who live around the Hellespont and the Euxine Sea	ὡς δὲ ἐγὼ πυνθάνομαι τῶν τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον καὶ Πόντον οἰκεόντων Ἑλλήνων
9.16.1	H. speaks to Thersander of Orchomenus, Thrace	ἤκουον Θερσάνδρου ἀνδρὸς μὲν Ὀρχομενίου

Appendix B

Autopsy by Location

The Greek World

Location	Direct Eyewitness	Still there in Herodotus' Day	Current Location / Position of Objects	ἀξιοθέητος	Other	Travel / Contact with a Specific Source
Delphi	1.51.3; 2.135.3	1.92.1; 8.39.2; 2.135.4	1.14.2-3; 1.50.3; 1.51.2-4; 3.57.2; 4.162.3; 8.27.5; 8.121.2; 8.122; 9.81.1	1.14.3; 1.25.2; 4.162.3		1.20
Samos	3.47.3	2.182.1; *3.48.3*	3.60; 3.142.2; 6.14.3	3.123.1	1.70; 4.88	
Athens and Attica		5.77.3	5.63.4; 5.77.4; 5.89.3			
Tegea		1.66.4		9.70.3		
Delos	2.170.2	6.98.1 (denial)	4.33-5			
Thebes	5.59	1.52; 1.92.1				
Thasos	6.47.1					2.44.4
Thermopylae			7.176.3; 7.225.2; 7.228			
Sparta and Laconia			1.69.4			3.55.2
Lindos			3.47.3	2.182.1		

Location	Direct Eyewitness	Still there in Herodotus' Day	Current Location / Position of Objects	ἀξιοθέητος	Other	Travel / Contact with a Specific Source
Cyrene		2.181.5				2.32.1
Thrace	2.103.1	*7.111.1*	7.59.2			9.16.1
Plataea	9.85.3		9.52			
Ephesus / Ionia	2.106.2-5	1.92.1; *6.42.2*				
Euxine Sea	4.81.3; 4.86			4.85.1		4.95.1

Other locations (each with only one reference):

Zacynthos (4.195.2), Thessaly (7.129.4), Isthmus (8.121.1), Argos/Aegina (*5.88.3*), Cyprus (*5.115.1*), Abae (8.33), Taenarum (1.24.8), Arcadia (6.74.2), Chersonese (9.116.2), Argiopius (9.57.2), Dodona (2.52.1), Hellespont (4.95.1).

The Near East

Location	Direct Eyewitness	Still there in Herodotus' Day	Current Location / Position of Objects	ἀξιοθέητος	Other	Travel / Contact with a Specific Source
Scythia	2.103.1; 4.11.4; 4.81.2; 4.82	4.124.1	4.11.4			4.14.1; 4.76.6
Colchis	2.104.1	*3.97.4*				2.104.1
Palestinian Syria	2.106.1; 3.5.2					
Phoenicia	2.44.1; 3.37.2					
Lydia	1.93.3; 3.5.2	1.93.2	1.93.6; 7.30.2			
Babylon	1.183.3; 1.193.4	1.181.2	1.178-200	1.184		

Egypt

Location	Direct Eyewitness	Still there in Herodotus' Day	Current Position / Location of Objects	ἀξιοθέητος	Other	Travel / Contact with a Specific Source
Egypt generally	2.5.1; 2.8.3; 2.10.1; 2.12.1; 2.29.1; 3.6.1	2.154.5		2.176.1		2.19; 2.77.1
Memphis	2.136.1; 3.37.2		2.99.4; 2.112.1; 2.141.6; 2.153; 2.176	2.176.2		2.2.5; 2.3.1; 2.13.1; 2.19; 2.113.1; 2.118.1
Sais	2.130.1; 2.131.3; 2.132.1; 2.170.2; 2.175.3	2.130.1; 2.131.3	2.130.2; 2.132.1; 2.169.4-170; 2.176	2.163.1		2.28.1-2
Thebes	2.143.2-3					2.3.1; 2.13.1; 2.19; 2.54.2-55.1
Heliopolis				2.111.4		2.3.1; 2.13.1; 2.19
Giza	2.125.6; 2.127.2		2.124.4-5		2.134.2	
Chemmis	2.156.1		2.91.2			2.91.5
Buto	2.75.1; 2.155.3-156.1					
Labyrinth / Lake Moeris	2.148.1, 5-6; 2.150.2					
Elephantine	2.29.1	*2.30.3*				
Canopic mouth of Nile		*2.113.2*	2.113.2			

Other locations (each with only one reference):

Bubastis (2.137.5; 2.138.2), Pelusium and Papremis (3.12), Red Sea (2.159.1), Daphnae (2.30.3), Barca (*4.204*), Ethiopia (*3.97.3*), Cissia (*6.119.4*), Ecbatana (1.98.3-6)

Note:

References for customs, practices or traditions are shown in italics.

Appendix C

Autopsy by Book

Reference	Book 1	Book 2	Book 3	Book 4	Book 5	Book 6	Book 7	Book 8	Book 9
Direct Eyewitness	3	29	4	7	1	1	1		1
Denial of Direct Eyewitness	1	3	1						
Objects still there or Customs still Practised in H.'s Day	5	10	2	4	4	3	2	2	
Current Location of Physical Objects	8	11	4	5	4	2	5	4	4
ἀξιοθέητος	3	5	1	2					1
Other	1	1		1					
TOTAL	**21**	**59**	**12**	**19**	**9**	**6**	**8**	**6**	**6**
Travel or Personal Contact with a Specific Source	1	15	1	3					1